AN ANSWER TO Certaine Obſervations of W. BRIDGES, concerning the preſent Warre againſt His MAJESTIE.

Whereby hee pretends to juſtifie it againſt that *Hexapla* of Conſiderations.

viz.

Theologicall, *Hiſtoricall*, *Legall*, *Criticall*, *Melancholy*, and *Fooliſh*;

Wherein, as he ſaith, it is look't upon by the ſquint-eyed multitude.

(Thomas Warmstry)

Printed in the Yeare, 1643.

18x14 (4) 68

LIBRARY OF THE
UNION
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY
NEW YORK
NOV 2 4 1944

To the READER.

ALthough I am not much in love with Apologies, yet for the prevention of objections in this cavilling age, give me leave to premise a word or two. It may be thought here that I have done too much and too little. Too much in that I have beene so large in my Answer unto so short a Preface. Too little in that I have not proceeded to a reply unto the Sermon it selfe, as well as to the Proœme. To the first I confesse it hath beene thought that my paines therein hath exceeded the merit of the Preface. Neither did I intend to bestow the fifth part of that paines about it that I have done; but if I have erred herein, I hope it may deserve a pardon, in that it hath proceeded from a desire to satisfie: nor need it be any wonder that the wedge is so much greater than the knot, since it is the wisest way for them that cannot endure the light to wrap up themselves as close as they can in obscure brevity. They that are to speake in an ill cause had best to take heed they say not too much, for the more they say of it, the more they betray it. Since it is a hard thing for them that have such a taske to be so vigilant over their pennes, but that in many expressions some discoveries will intrude; it is very difficult to be constant in falshood, and therefore errours had need have but a narrow way to walke in, lest they betray themselves by their reeling. You can hardly give a lye so good a tire, but if

you ty it not up it will betray it ſelfe. But for the truth, which is my buſineſſe, the more it is unfolded the more it is preſerved; and indeed, the more cloſely errour is wrapt up and intangled, the more worke is neceſſary for the unraveling it. The worke of Maſter Bridges, *as it is a worke of darkeneſſe, ſo it is a worke of thicke darkeneſſe, like a thicke compacted cloud of errours, incorporated one into another; and my worke is to diſperſe this cloud, and to lay open theſe errours. And if the diſperſion of a cloud take up more roome than the thickning or condenſation of it, I hope the light that did it is no way to be blamed. Beſides, in the perſecution of one or a few falſhoods we are many times led into the view of many profitable and neceſſary truths: and if I have made my journey ſo much the longer to take them along with me, ſo that I have not gone much out of my way, I preſume the Readers profit may excuſe my labour.*

For the ſecond objection, my anſwer is briefe. That the truth is, I finde nothing in the Sermon of any danger, and therefore as a toothleſſe dogge I might well truſt it amongſt the nakedſt people without a muzzle. And ſo having ſaid thus much for thy ſatisfaction, I intreat thee to reade without prejudice, with an upright unengaged judgement, with a reſolution to embrace the truth where thou find'ſt it, and to relinquiſh errour where thou diſcover'ſt it. And ſo I commend thee to God, and reſt

An earneſt deſirer of thy ſalvation,
and of the peace of the Church
and State,

THO: WARMSTRY.

AN ANSWER TO CERTAINE OBSERVATIONS of W. BRIDGES, concerning the preſent Warre againſt His MAJESTIE; whereby he pretends to juſtifie it againſt that *Hexapla* of conſiderations: *viz.* Theologicall, Hiſtoricall, Legall, *&c.*

NOt to trouble my ſelfe much with thoſe impertinencies, in the beginning of your Preface; where you moſt raſhly and impiouſly ſet our bleſſed Saviours name in the ſtile of this unchriſtianlike deſigne, calling it the buſineſſe of Chriſt Jeſus his Kingdome: And as you tranſgreſſe againſt Piety there, ſo againſt Charity too in the ſame clauſe, as if your malice were not active enough, if you did not in the ſame breath and ſentence blaſpheme God and injure man. You ſtile the good and obedient people of the Land by that ſcornfull title of *The ſquint-eyed multitude*, as if every eye were aſquint that is not bloudſhotten like yours. And to let paſſe your ſlighting of thoſe bookes that have beene ſet forth,

which you ſay have had their anſwers, though I could tell you that all have not beene anſwered that we know of. And for thoſe anſwers of yours and ſome others to Doctor *Ferne*, whom you bite in the margine, their anſwers have had replyes too: nor yet to inſiſt upon your vaine promiſes of delivering the ſenſe of the whole in that of *Rom.* 13. *He that reſiſteth, &c.* which it may be you were afraid to ſpeake out, leſt your owne pen ſhould tranſcribe your ſentence, and allot unto you that judgement or damnation which the Apoſtle there denounceth againſt reſiſters of the higher powers; and in that of the Evangeliſt, reſiſt not evill, *&c.* And to give you leave to paſſe over, and let goe Fathers, Councells, the Doctrine of our owne Biſhops, ſince they are ſo little for your turne. I leave all theſe upon your ſcore, and come to obſerve upon your *Obſervations* which you commend unto your Reader.

And firſt in the Theologicall conſideration, you obſerve thus:

1. *That the King muſt command not onely according to Gods Law, but mans alſo.*

Anſw. It is moſt true, That the King is bound in duty to regulate his commands by the rules of the Law of God and the Kingdome, and if he doth otherwiſe he ſinnes, and is anſwerable to God for it. But it doth by no meanes follow that he is anſwerable unto the Subjects, or corrigible by them, for all correction is to proceed from a Superiour; and the King who is acknowledged to be ſupreame, hath no Superiour on earth to judge him.

2. *That if he doe not ſo command, the reſiſtance is not a reſiſtance of power but will.*

Anſw. Though the King doe exceed the limits of his duty, yet the reſiſtance may be a reſiſtance of his power; for they that judge not ſuperficially of things may eaſily diſcerne, That a Kings power is larger then his duty: And he may exceed his duty in commanding, and yet his authority may injoyne the Subject to obey. *Pharoah* exceeded his duty in commanding the *Iſraelites* to make brick without ſtraw. And *Cæſar's* Officers exceeded the limits both of the Law of God and man, when

when againſt the liberty of the Subject they require tribute of our Saviour, yet wee have examples of obedience in both. There are ſomethings unlawfull for a Governour to command, which are not unlawfull for the Subject to obey, as in the caſes before named, and in all tyrannous and frivolous commands; in ſuch caſes we may petition, and ſome admoniſh and reprove the King, with reverence, and put him in minde of his duty: or in caſe he will not heare, we may uſe the weapons of the Church, *Preces & lachrymæ*, we may complaine to God who is above the King, and the ſole Moderator betwixt Him and Subjects, but we muſt obey and remember that ſuch commands are the Governours ſinne, but our puniſhment. Indeed, if the Governour command the Subject to doe that which the Law of God forbids him to do, he muſt not yeild active obedience, but obey God rather than men. But yet he muſt not reſiſt by taking up Armes or the like, but patiently ſubmit to ſuffer the puniſhment. Otherwiſe, I pray you reſolve me, why the three children yeilded their bodies to the furnace, when *Nebuchadnezzar* commanded them, againſt the Law of God, to worſhip the golden Image, if they had held it lawfull to reſiſt, they might as well have looked for aſſiſtance from Heaven to have made good their party againſt the Tyrant, as that God ſhould preſerve them in the midſt of the fire? But the Text notes it of them, that they yeilded their bodies, which implyes a voluntary ſubmiſſion. And yet the command was againſt the Law of God; and *Nebuchadnezzar* aſwell as King CHARLES ought to have commanded, not onely according to the Law of God, but of man alſo. If you are wiſe and peaceable, you ought to conſider, that as the Kings duty is to regulate him, upon paine of Gods diſpleaſure; ſo his power is to regulate us, ſometimes where he exceedes his duty; and if where he tranſgreſſes the Law of God, much more where he tranſgreſſes the limits of humane Lawes, which notwithſtanding he is bound in conſcience to obſerve.

3. *That to ſay ſuch a reſiſtance muſt be onely defenſive is non-ſenſe, for ſo a man may be reſiſting ever and never. Reſiſt like the ſilly women, of whom the Apoſtle ſaith, They are ever learning, and never attaine the truth.* *Anſw.*

Anſw. Nor never are like to doe, unleſſe they meet with better teachers than you appeare to be; for indeed here you ſpeake the plaineſt falſhood of any the moſt impudent advocate, that for ought I know hath pleaded in that cauſe you are fee'd in: and we are to thanke you for your plaine dealing, it is honeſtly done however that you will ſpeake your minde; if all men ſhould doe ſo, I am perſwaded we ſhould have a ſpeedy end of the buſineſſe. I was in doubt the people ſhould have beene borne in hand, that this warre againſt the King had beene onely defenſive, but you have drawne the curtaine, and will juſtifie it ſeemes the legality of it as an offenſive warre. That it is lawfull to ſet up an offenſive reſiſtance againſt the King, in caſe he command either againſt the Law of God or man. And your reaſon indeed drawne from non-ſenſe, *Argumentum ab abſurdo* it is I confeſſe; it is non-ſenſe ſay you, to hold that we may in ſuch caſe reſiſt the King, onely by a defenſive reſiſtance. This if any is the ſenſe of your Obſervation, and how doe you make this good? Why thus, an't pleaſe you; for ſo ſay you a man may be reſiſting ever, and never reſiſt. Indeed I confeſſe that is plaine non-ſenſe to ſay, that a man ſhould be ever reſiſting and yet never reſiſt; as well you may be ever a good Subject, and yet never obey your Prince. Yea, indeed upon the point it is the very ſame, to be ever reſiſting and never reſiſt; as to be ever reſiſting and yet to be a good Subject: ſince not to reſiſt is eſſentiall to a good Subject. And therefore in ſtiling this non-ſenſe you accuſe your ſelfe, ſince that is the maine buſineſſe. You are about to make us beleeve that reſiſtance and ſubjection may well ſtand together: ſo that if that be non-ſenſe, as you ſtile it, there is but little ſenſe in the maine attempt of your diſcourſe. And I can ſee no more reaſon for you to ſay, that it is no more ſenſe to admit of defenſive reſiſtance without an offenſive, then to ſay a man may ever and never reſiſt. Or is there no difference betweene a ſhield and a ſword: nature and reaſon allowes a ſervant to ſave his head if he can from his maſters cudgell, and I know no Law either of God or man that forbids it. But yet you muſt take heed how you allow a ſervant to deale offenſively againſt his maſter, leſt

you

you ſet houſes on fire as well as the common-wealth. It is no non-ſenſe to admit of one thing with the denyall of another, in aſſertion or diſcourſe, which may and ought ſometimes to be done without the other, in action and performance. But it ſeemes there is no ſenſe, reaſon, nor religion, that doth not comply with your purpoſes. Thoſe are the onely rules of truth and falſhood, good and evill; yet methinkes you might have done well to have ſpared the Apoſtle, for you ſeeme to be very bold in quoting that ſaying of his, nay of the Holy Ghoſt, as a parallell to that which you call non-ſenſe, as if the Apoſtles ſaying of ſilly women (ſuch as your faction leadeth away) *That they are ever learning, and never attaine to the truth*, were no better ſenſe than for a man to be ſaid *to be ever reſiſting, and yet never to reſiſt*. It is no wonder that you are over-bold with Gods Subſtitute, when you are ſo ſawcy with God himſelfe. Remember you have ſomething to anſwer another day for this: your calling might have admoniſhed you to have dealt more reverently with the Scripture, then to have brought in any part of that, as an inſtance or parallell of non-ſenſe: but howſoever we may know your meaning by this, that if the people pleaſe to quarrell at the Kings government, or to conceive any of his commands to be againſt, or not according to the Lawes of God or man, they may not onely defend their owne rights or perſons by force and armes, but even offer violence to his Sacred Perſon in a vindictive way, and in allowing an offenſive reſiſtance without any reſtraint or limitation, you lay a faire ground, for ought any man can ſee, even for killing the King, either by force or treachery, for this without all queſtion lyeth within the generality of an offenſive reſiſtance: it was pity you did not live, or were not better knowne in the beginning of King *James* his reigne, you would have made an excellent Chaplaine to *Guy Faux*, or the reſt of the Gunpowder-Traytors. What though they were Papiſts, that had beene no great matter: They whoſe ſtomachs can digeſt ſuch iron principles as theſe, like enough would not have beene very ſqueamiſh in point of religion. But for your Argument, Aſſertion, Obſervation, or what you will call it, truely it ſcarce deſerves an an-

ſwer; yet the wiſe man may ſeeme to admoniſh me to give you one, leſt you ſhould be wiſe in your owne conceit: And therefore I tell you, that the Apoſtle forbids that any reſiſtance at all ſhould be made againſt the higher power; and the higher the power is the more wicked the reſiſtance: and therefore to reſiſt your Prince, which is your Supreame, is the moſt wicked of all reſiſtance. And the Apoſtle gives you a reaſon, becauſe it is the ordinance of God; and it is ſhewed before, that reſiſtance even in ſuch caſe where the Magiſtrates commands are not according to the Law of God or man, is a reſiſtance of the power as well as of the will of the Magiſtrate, and therefore is not to be undertaken *ſub pœnâ κρίματος*, under paine of judgement, or damnation: and they that like the wages let them ſet up the worke. Beſides, this is to put a ſword as it were into every offenders hand, to provide for his owne life or freedome, even by the ruine and deſtruction of the King or Magiſtrate, if he can but have faith enough to perſwade himſelfe that he is condemned contrary to the Law either of God or man; and certainly he had a very dull braine that could not finde colour enough for ſuch a perſwaſion, in the worſt caſe almoſt we can imagine, eſpecially if that old note be true, *Quod quiſque vult id ipſum putat.* There needs no great ſtrength of argument to perſwade a theefe or murderer that hee ought not to be hang'd, but I doubt I ſhall take too much paines with you. There's an end of your three Obſervations of the buſineſſe, as it is look't on, as you ſay, in a Theologicall conſideration: and for ought I ſee, the people may looke aſquint ſtill for any thing you have yet applyed for the rectifying of their ſight.

The next ſurvey you are pleaſed to take of the matter, is to correct the errours of the people in their Hiſtoricall view of it: you conceive their complaints to be groundleſſe, when they conceive and ſay, Never ſuch times, ſuch taxations, ſuch preſidents, ſuch a warre, *&c.* never? Yes, you can tell them of the twentieth part, fifteenth part, ſeventh part, as in the reigne of King *John*, and others. And you cite the Chronicle too of *Edw.* 2. in the margent: truly I have ſcarce leiſure for the preſent to examine the Chronicle to confute you. We reade indeed

indeed of a ſixth penny levied of temporall mens goods, in the time of *Edw.* 2. and what others you have found out in your Hiſtoricall tranſlations, it makes no great matter if they be of the ſame ſtampe. But can you finde a preſident of a twentieth part impoſed by an Ordinance of the two Houſes of Parliament, without and againſt the King, and for the maintenance of ſo unnaturall a warre? can you finde any preſident for thoſe legall robberies, that authenticall theevery under the name of plundering and that working of iniquity by a Law? But however you ſeeme to take the people for pretty eaſie and tame fooles, while you would perſwade them to lie downe whil'ſt they are loaded, becauſe their forefathers perhaps have gone before them in ſuffering the like or more grievous preſſures. What? doe you meane to preſcribe for tyranny and oppreſſion? But to come to your Obſervations, you will have thoſe that are willing to learne, to know,

1. *That if ſome be taken away, it is to preſerve them and the reſt.*

Anſw. That's more then you can aſſure them: rather it may ſeeme to be for the deſtruction both of themſelves and the reſidue of their eſtates, ſince it is but oyle caſt into that fire, which is likely if not quenched, to expoſe all unto deſolation. And if thoſe mad-men that have hitherto fed that flame with the expence of their eſtates, were they not *jurati in inſaniam*, they have had experience enough to have beene as good as a Bedlam to them, and make them now at length to grow wiſer, and e'en let that goe which is already gone, untill the publique faith ſhall come to her lands, and make much of that wit they have received for intereſt, and ſhut up their hungry purſes and coffers with that motto of the Poet, *Scelus eſt poſt omnia perdere naulum*: That they may at leaſt keep ſomething to bury them. Yea, it may prove a great bleſſing if thoſe purges they have received of that over-much fulneſſe, which hath made them ſwell ſo much with pride, to the diſturbance of the State, may now leave them in a more healthfull temper of humility, to the quieting thereof. This would enrich them much more in their mindes, then they are impoveriſhed in their eſtates, and be an

excellent recompenſe for all their loſſes. But little doe you thinke what an excellent Obſervation this of yours might have beene, had you vented it but two or three yeares ſooner, for the juſtification of Ship money. And yet I doubt it would ſcarce have gone for weight then, and we had beſt looke well to the ſcales, e're we accept it for ſo now, leſt if this once goe for currant, it be made a common colour for the greateſt oppreſſions, and moſt injurious and perpetuall taxations of the people, though (if it be poſſible) more illegall than that of the impoſition of the twentieth part, if it be enough to beare the people in hand; That if ſome be taken away, it is to preſerve them and the reſt. But what an age of fancies doe we live in? can you tell the people who it is that would take away either their eſtates or their lives; or if you could, is there any honeſty in it, That you ſhould take away the peoples goods without Law, and pleaſe them by telling them no body elſe ſhould robbe them? Or to perſwade them to throw their eſtates into the fire, to keepe them out of the hands of theeves; ſmall comfort in this. What is the next Obſervation to make the matter faire in the Hiſtoricall proſpect?

The ſecond Obſervation is by way of queſtion,

Whether they had rather part with it to the Parliament, or that and their lives too to the Cavaleirs?

Anſw. Truely this is a hard queſtion. A pittifull neceſſity that the poore people are brought into: it were worth the while to conſider who they are that have ſhut them up into ſuch an uncomfortable *Dilemma*, and what is the cauſe that they are ſo concluded: and ſure it is no hard matter to diſcerne. Wee can yet remember that there was a time not long ſince, when there was no neceſſity of either of theſe, when the Royall Authority of His Majeſtie, and the knowne Lawes of the Kingdome were in force, and yeilded the due protection to the Subjects; and they returned their due obedience unto them, till theſe hedges were broken downe, under the pretence of mending the gaps in them: there was no roome for ſo ſad a queſtion. And therefore the people may know whom they have to thank for it, even thoſe that for the bringing to paſſe of

their

their owne ambitious and turbulent deſignes, have removed thoſe ancient land-markes, and demoliſhed thoſe knowne and certaine bounds and fences, and inſtead thereof brought in a new ambulatory, uncertaine Government by Ordinances of the Lords and Commons aſſembled in Parliament, in oppoſition to the ancient and ſetled fundamentall Lawes of the Kingdome, and without and againſt the Royall Authority of the King. And now it ſeemes the people (if you may be Judge) are left onely to this lamentable choyce, from whoſe hand they ſhall receive their ruine: or whether they will undergoe a voluntary ſlavery on the one ſide, or an enforced one on the other. This is not much unlike that miſerable choyce that *David* was put unto, in the 2d of *Samuel*, 24. chapter, and the 13. and 14. verſes. Whether the ſword, or the famine, or the peſtilence ſhould be the reward of numbering of the people. That *David* was indeed to ſubmit unto, (though as he ſaith he was in a great ſtrait) becauſe it was ſent unto him by God, by the Prophet *Gad*, a Prophet of the Lord. And *David* wiſely makes it his choice to fall into the hands of God, and not into the hands of men. And truely the ſtrait that you put the people into, me thinkes is worſe in ſome reſpect than *Davids*. They muſt needes it ſeemes by you fall into the hands of men. And indeed I confeſſe we doe well deſerve it, becauſe the hand of the Lord in the plague and peſtilence, which hath beene ſo long and ſo often upon us of late in this Kingdome; and I thinke ſcarce yet removed, though it is as it were drowned in a greater judgement, hath done ſo little or no good upon us. But what Divinity is it, I beſeech you, that ſent you upon this errand upon the people, or who made you to be a Prophet *Gad* unto them, to circumſcribe them within the limits of ſo hard an election? Or how long have they beene Gods, into whoſe hands you would have them fall? Or what doe you meane by thoſe ſtrange unheard of monſters, the Cavaleirs, that you make ſuch bugbeares to fright the people with? Or how comes this name of honour and dignity to be made by you, and others of your party, a name of reproach and diſgrace? I pray you tell us what this ſtrange word ſignifies, that we may know theſe hor-

rid creatures by their names: let me tell you, it little becomes one that is a pretender to learning, to give his vote to ſo fooliſh a denomination, to ſo injurious a debaſement and miſacception of an innocent and honourable terme. Fooliſh it is, let whoſe will be the *Nomenclator*, for names or titles are impoſed for diſtinction, and to ſet forth unto us the nature of things as they differ from others; and that either according to the importance of the word or title, which doth in the etymologie or ſenſe of it repreſent the thing entitled thereby; or elſe according to a cuſtomary received uſe and acception of the word or ſtile, whereby it is by uſurpation drawne from that which it properly ſignifies to repreſent ſome other thing, either by limiting the ſignification thereof, or diverting it to ſomething that hath ſome reſemblance or analogy unto the proper ſignification, or perhaps through meere ignorance of barbariſme, or a blinde and wilfull preſcription of cuſtome, embraced by the people at all adventures; which notwithſtanding when it is once growne currant, it is no wiſedome in any to contradict, ſo that it be but an harmeleſſe abſurdity: or elſe ſometimes names or ſtiles are impoſed upon individuals which are of that multitude, and their perſonall properties ſo obſcure, that they can hardly be all knowne, or deſigned by proper attributes, upon ſuch ſometimes, and indeed moſt commonly, unleſſe by ſome extraordinary providence they are imployed by thoſe that have the power, *ex inſtituto*, of meere voluntary choice of the impoſers, without any regard unto any ſimilitude or proportion that the name beareth unto the perſon, upon which it is impoſed as a meere voluntary marke upon them, to diſtinguiſh them from others; or ſometimes they are impoſed as common markes upon thoſe that are of the ſame ſtock and kindred, either by originall deſcent, or by tranſlation, or engraffing, as by matrimoniall contract, adoption, or the like. But this ſtile as you have no ground at all to make this a ſtile of ignominy unto any, indeed as a name of honour, ſo it hath been uſed as *Eques* which is a Cavalier in *Latine*, was an ordinary and almoſt the onely uſuall word to ſignifie a Gentleman, or Nobleman amongſt the *Romans*; and ſo you may plead the uſage of the word to ap-

ply

ply it to His Majesties Army, where you may finde almost all the Gentry, and the greatest part of the Nobility of the Kingdome, whom you may not amisse in this sense stile the Cavaliers, in opposition to that Rabble of the meaner sort of discontented people, that make up the *Bellum servile* on the other side. So indeed it is very proper to designe forth those noble and honourable Commanders of His Majestie, whose veines are full of Princely and Noble bloud, that can admit of no taint of disloyalty, in opposition to those right honourable Button-makers, and the rest of those right famous mechanicke Commanders, who are of late become intolerable fumblers in this strange and new trade of warre, to the great danger of their forgetting of their occupations. But how than doth it become a name of reproach amongst you? surely wee may well guesse what care you have, and the rest of your party, to maintaine the honour and dignity of the State, when you goe about to make the very termes of honour to become contumelies and reproaches. Is it not enough for you to put confusion into the frame of the State, but you must also confound the language of the Common-wealth. But indeed you may be excused perhaps in point of policy, for you were somewhat hard driven to finde out a stile for the designation of that party whom you oppose; and therefore it is no wonder if in so great necessity you take the boldnesse to make a force upon the language, as well as the estates and liberties of the Subject, by drawing the one by violence from their proper signification, as well as the other from their proper possessours; for indeed what should we call them. Rebels? Surely that might have done well, but it seemes your consciences could not digest so great and palpable a misapplication: you know well to whom that stile did properly belong it's like, and you could not be so injurious unto them, as to make so unjust an alienation of their property. What than? should you call them the Royalists, or the Kings party? No. There was no policy in that, for it was necessary for you to use His Majesties name, that you might not fright the people with a bare-fac't rebellion; but therein indeed you doe exceedingly discolour it, and in going about to hide it, you lay the wickednesse

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
Library of the
New York

neſſe thereof ſo much the more bare unto any diſcerning eye. The very ſtile of your warre condemnes the very action of it, and declares you to be aſhamed of your owne enterpriſe, ſince you are faine to maske over the face of it with an empty vayle of a pretence of loyalty, and therein you fulfill that ſaying of our Saviour; *He that doth evill hateth the light, neither cometh unto the light, becauſe their deedes are evill.* Oh that you durſt be but ſo honeſt, ſo ingenuous in your wickedneſſe, as to averre that you doe in plaine termes. Surely this ſculking under falſe colours, and hiding of your ſelves behind a thred, makes but little for the credit of your deſigne, if you dare juſtifie what you doe ſpeake plainly; and let the people know it, leſt hereafter when they finde how they have beene deceived, they fall to curſe you for your colluſion, when they ſhall lie weltring in their owne bloud, and ſhall expire in the votes of your damnation. But it is the nature of vice to be ſo conſcious of its deformity, as not to dare to come abroad but under the name of vertue. Treaſon dares as well be hang'd, drawne, and quartered, as be ſeene abroad without a diſguiſe. And therefore however you (I ſpeake not of you all) may ſeeke the ruine of His Majeſties Perſon or Government, yet you will proteſt to maintaine His Majeſties Perſon, and His Honour and Eſtate too: And your ſtile muſt be for the King and Parliament, wherein indeed you let us know if we had eyes, that you ought to be for the King, and in being againſt him, your owne titſe confeſſeth you to be ———. But I pray you by the way, why is not for God and the King as good, as for the King and Parliament? I pray you tell us why you unſheath'd you ſwords againſt thoſe that come under that motto into your hands, is it becauſe you are againſt God? or againſt the King? or are you for them ſeverally, or againſt them when together? Me-thinks ſuch a conjunction ſhould make no ſeparation. Well, but however you are for the King: you durſt not truſt the queazineſſe of the peoples ſtomacks without this allay of His Majeſties name upon that hard diet you preſcribe them. But indeed we may thanke them for it, for had they beene but of ſo ſtrong a conſtitution as you could have wiſht, it's probable they ſhould

ne're

ne're have had that ſawce unto their meat, but the name as well as the authority of His Majeſtie ſhould have beene forgotten amongſt you, unleſſe ſometimes you had thought good to talke of him in reproach, or ſo. I remember a pretty tryall that was once made upon the people unto this purpoſe; perhaps it was not ſo well noted by all men. When that ſtrange Ordinance of the *Militia* was to be put in execution in the County of *Warwick*, by the late Lord *Brookes*, and ſome others that were put in commiſſion for that purpoſe, the Warrants for the drawing together of that County, were firſt ſent abroad without His Majeſties name, to feele the people, as it may ſeeme, whether they would digeſt it or no; and if it had paſſed for currant, it's a great queſtion whether the King ſhould have beene heard of any more in the buſineſſe. But when the Commiſſioners found the diſlike of the people, and that the Warrants were excepted againſt as invalid, for want of the mention of the Kings Authority: they could readily then pretend it as an over-ſight, and miſtake in the drawing of the Warrants, and it was preſently mended. And ever ſince the Kings name (if I may ſo ſpeake) hath beene taken in vaine, and is ſet as a lye unto the whole buſineſſe. But, I pray you, give me leave a little, is there any likelyhood that that was an over-ſight? did they imploy men of no better truſt and diſcretion in the tranſcribing and ſending abroad of their Warrants, that none of them could diſcerne the errour? or could they be ſo ſtrangely conſtant in a miſtake in a matter of ſo great moment, as to let it paſſe through ſuch a multitude of Warrants, as were then ſent abroad into that County, and no man amongſt them all ſo wiſe as to reforme it in any one of them? Things that are done by miſtake and over-ſight are commonly found but rare and inconſtant: but when the ſame errour goes through a whole buſineſſe, it leaves a dangerous conjecture that it was purpoſely committed; and then certainly that had more of the Foxe, than of the Lyon. But what a ſtrange unlucky thing it was, that they could light upon no errour but that, that they muſt needs leave out the principall ſinew of the Warrant? Surely a man may doubt the King and his authority was but very ſlightly fixed in their thoughts, that

they could not ſo much as dreame of him in the writing out of ſo many Warrants. What confidence can the people have, that the great buſineſſe they looke after ſhall be well mannaged in the hands of thoſe that are ſo apt to over-ſee? They had need to take heed how they follow them at a venture, or how they commit their conſciences unto their guidance. But ſure if it were an over-ſight, it would make a man gueſſe that there was *Digitus Dei* in it, to make them ſpeake plainly their intentions againſt their wills, and that God ſuffered them in their haſte to ſend the hagge abroad undreſt, and without her vaile. That the people, if they would not be wilfully blinde, might ſee what a beautifull buſineſſe they were invited to admit into their embraces. And that they might behold this rebellion in its owne colours, and learne to hate and abhorre it with their ſoules, for ſurely the face is the ſame ſtill, though the maske be on; and they that are ſo eaſie as to beleeve otherwiſe, are doubly abuſed, and made at once not onely Rebels, but even ſtarke fooles and Idiots. But the people diſliked it naked, and ſo the vayle was quickly put on againe, and all was well. Now they muſt beleeve there is nothing but beauty in it: the Kings ſtile walkes fairely in the front of the buſineſſe, and they muſt rebell againſt the King, for the King and Parliament. And ſo they muſt by no meanes call them that are truly for His Majeſtie, the Kings party, or by any name like unto that; but the name of Cavaliers muſt be their ſtile, and, though without ſenſe or reaſon, their contumelie and reproach too. But a man of your learning ſhould not have ſubſcribed to ſuch an abſurd and ſenſeleſſe injury, done unto a harmeleſſe and honourable terme.

At leaſt a man of your calling ſhould have beene wary how you had contributed to the preſent and future diſtempers of the people, by ſetting your hand to the paſſe of an odious terme, that ſerves for nothing, as it is now uſed, but to maintaine rancour and hatred amongſt thoſe that you ſhould endeavour to unite in the boſome of the ſame Church, and in the body of the ſame Common-wealth. For my part, I beleeve thoſe two names of *Cavaliers* and *Roundheads*, as they are now in uſe amongſt ſome, were the inventions of the Arch-enemy of mankinde,

kinde, to blow the fire of diviſion withall amongſt us, and to nurſe up an irreconcileable variance in this Nation. And therefore I could wiſh there were a Law made for the utter aboliſhing of both thoſe names, as they are now uſed for names of oppoſition, leaſt the Devill and his complices under the one caſt an *odium* upon the ſervice of God, and under the other upon loyalty to our Prince. For my part I will endeavour to keepe them both out of my mouth in any ſuch odious acception, ſith I conceive them to be full of uncharitable non-ſenſe. And I am ſure you did not well to become the Devils fueller, by contributing to the paſſage of that odious title as it is made, whereby you here entitle the Kings Subjects: it were more proper worke for you to quench fires, then to foment them. But we know well enough who you meane, and is it neceſſary then that we muſt be devoured by the *Cavaliers*, as you call them; or the *Parliament*? Is our great expectation of the redreſſe of our grievances come to this? Is this the fruit of two yeares conſultation? Is this all the advantage that hath beene made unto the poore abuſed people of the Land, of all thoſe large and happy opportunities, that have beene afforded this Parliament for the procurement of the good and ſafety of Church and State: that out of our feares and doubts we ſhould be now concluded and ſhut up unto an unavoidable ruine? Sure if it be ſo, we muſt needs conclude, that the wiſedome of humane Counſels is not omnipotent; and that the *Argos* eyes of the greateſt politique bodies may be ſometimes ſo charmed aſleepe, as to betray their charge unto danger, eſpecially when they intercept the free entercourſe betwixt themſelves and the head, and that there is no confiding even in Parliaments themſelves. And it may be God is now about to teach us this leſſon, That we may learne to rely upon none but him; and that he hath now ſuffered us to faile of our hopes, that he may inſtruct us by experience to place them better, than upon the wiſedome or power of any concurrence of humanity, even upon none, but upon that indefeatable power, and that incorruptible wiſedome that is in God himſelfe. And indeed this leſſon if it be well learn't may be worth more to us than any other good that we gaped for, ſince there can be no greater ſtrengthening

unto a Nation or People, then to teach them to deny all ſtrength in the creature, and to caſt themſelves totally upon God. I confeſſe for my owne part I once thought with the reſt, That the calling of a Parliament had beene almoſt that *Panchreſton*, that πάνδολικον, that univerſall medicine, that would have brought with it a cure for all our diſeaſes. Yea, and I yet thinke, that if we take a Parliament in the right and genuine ſenſe, as it is, or ought to be, an entire body, unmaymed, unmangled, and undivided, it is one of the beſt grounds for a confidence to reſt on, that the ſphere of mortality can yeild us. And therefore if we be not altogether indocible, the Lord hath hereby taken the moſt abſolute and ſummary courſe, to beat off our dependance upon any earthly thing that wee can almoſt poſſibly imagine; ſinee he hath hereby ſhewed us the fayling of that, which of moſt things that the world can affoord, was moſt likely to yeild an all-ſufficiency to our hopes. But I could wiſh, if it had pleaſed God, that we might have learn't this document by ſome more gentle meanes, and that we had not deſerved to have ſuch a curſe ſent upon that which we tooke for the greateſt of our bleſſings, as to be put into ſuch a miſerable ſtrait betweene the devouring jawes of two inevitable deſtructions, like the poore *Iſraelites* betweene the *Egyptians* and the Sea; or like the miſerable *Brittaines* infeſted by the *Picts*, betweene the ſlaughter of the enemy, and the devouring of the waves, when they ſent that lamentable complaint unto the *Romans*, To *Agidius* thrice Conſull the ſighs of the *Brittains*. The enemy drives us to the Sea, the Sea drives us backe againe to the enemy, ſo betweene both we are either drowned or ſlaine: but yet we hope better for all your Augury, God can open a paſſage where you can ſee none, for the eſcaping of both theſe dangers. To conclude this point, we have two Anſwers to your Obſervation. Firſt, it is but your groundleſſe preſumption and ſurmiſe, or rather it may be your excogitated pretence; That if thoſe you ſpeake of ſhould yet be ſo juſt as to let men alone with their propriety and liberties, they ſhould then neceſſarily be made a prey both in their goods and lives unto thoſe you ſtile *Cavaliers*. Nay, we doe firmely beleeve, that if they

might

might be ſuffered to retaine their owne, and not forced or perſwaded by you and your like, to contribute to that unjuſtifiable deſigne which is on foot, they might have a farre more comfortable enjoyment of their eſtates and lives too, by the protection of His Majeſties goodneſſe and juſtice, then you can promiſe them by that courſe you adviſe them to: whether it be that you would have them be content to be plundered, or willingly to offer up their rights. Neither doe thoſe that have experience of them finde the *Cavaliers* (as you ſtile them) ſuch ravenous beaſts as you would make them, I could name ſome places where they have moſt to doe, where the people enjoy both their lives and goods farre more peaceably and quietly upon the termes and obedience and ſubjection to their Prince, then as we beleeve you in *London* can boaſt of, or any other places where your party hath long ſetled. Witneſſe *Oxford*, *Worceſter*, and the reſt. We heare not in thoſe places of any ſuch violence offered to men in their eſtates and liberties, as you have ſo frequent amongſt you in other places.

But if the danger were as great as you would make it. In the ſecond place it is but a poore miſerable comfort that you offer unto the poore people, when you would have them give up their eſtates unto your party, that they may be free from the *Cavaliers*. *Ne moriare mori* is a ſtrange kinde of medicine, you would not like ſuch a *recipe* from your Phyſitian, I beleeve. This is in a ſort to adviſe a man to drowne himſelfe, and tell him it is a ſure way to ſcape hanging: or to caſt his goods into the Sea, to keepe them from a Pirat. Or as if one ſhould meet me upon the high-way, and adviſe me to give him my purſe upon faire termes, leaſt another that comes after may take it by force: it is indeed to perſwade the people to imbrace a certaine ruine to avoid a poſſible one. But thirdly, what juſtice is it in your party to take upon them to deprive the Subjects of their rights and liberties, under the pretence of preventing others from doing them the like, or a greater miſchiefe. That conſcience walkes by no perfect rule that thinkes it lawfull to commit the leaſt injuſtice, to prevent another from doing a greater. And therefore this your Obſervation is a very poore

allay, either unto the peoples miſery and oppreſſion, or unto the guilt of thoſe that act it upon them: and your queſtion upon the matter in the Hiſtoricall conſideration, Whether they had rather part with it, that is, with their eſtates to the *Parliament*, or that and their lives too to the *Cavaliers*, makes not a mite either to the comfort of their wretched condition, or to the juſtice of their illegall taxations, which yet we beleeve in all things conſiderable, is unparallelled in any Hiſtory. And therefore notwithſtanding all that you have ſaid, they may ſtill cry out, never ſuch times, ſuch taxations, ſuch precedents, ſuch a warre. And ſo I have done with your ſecond ſort of Obſervations.

The third claſſis of your Commentations, is upon the buſineſſe in a legall conſideration, wherein you offer ſome Propoſitions to thoſe your Malignants, as you call them, that are skilled in the Law.

The firſt is, *Whether you had better truſt to your owne ſtrength, or another mans favour for your defence?*

Anſw. This queſtion I can ſcarce ſee how it is very pertinent to the buſineſſe in hand, but whilſt you are obſcure, you thinke perhaps that wee are bound to take you to be wiſe; but as it is you may take this anſwer to it. That it is not very good for you to truſt either to your owne ſtrength, or another mans favour for your ſafety: and I would adviſe you to write more divine like hereafter, then to build upon ſuch ſuppoſitions of carnall confidence. The beſt way is for you to truſt God alone for your ſafety, and that you may have comfort in that, to live in that ſubjection and obedience to your lawfull Soveraigne, his immediate ſubſtitute, as the Lord requires at your hands; and that's the ſafeſt way for the people too; for they are like to find but little advantage to themſelves, that goe about to worke out their owne ſecurity by reſiſting the divine ordinance: leave therefore theſe carnall contrivances, and if you are wiſe and honeſt, ſhew it in adviſing the people to live in that obedience unto His Majeſty, that God, who hath placed Him over them, looks for from them; teach them without conſulting with the fleſh, to doe that God requires of them, who

is

is beſt able to ſecure them againſt all dangers that can befall them in their duties unto Him: and yet let me tell you withall, that though wee muſt not truſt upon the favour of any other for our ſafety, yet where God hath ſo ordered it in his providence, and enjoyned it by his authority, wee muſt make uſe of the favour of another, or at leaſt of the juſtice and authority of another for our defence and ſafeguard, and not altogether of our owne ſtrength; or otherwiſe, what confuſion would it not bring into the world, if every man muſt ſtand or fall by his owne ſtrength, the weakeſt would be ſure then to goe to the wall, and every man that were more powerfull then another, might be ready to build up his owne ſecurity by the danger and ruine of others that had leſſe ſtrength then he, though farre greater right; but you tell us what you meane here by ſtrength, *My ſtrength* (ſay you) *is the Law, againſt which if the Government command, it does me wrong, if I obey, I doe my ſelfe wrong.* To this I anſwer, that it is true in ſome ſenſe, that the ſtrength of the Subject is the Law under God; but yet this ſtrength which is the law is not to be managed or inforc't by every private hand; but by him principally to whom God hath principally given the charge of it, within this Kingdome is his Majeſty, whoſe authority and power is to give life unto the law, either immediately by himſelfe, or by his ſubordinate inſtruments, unto whom authority is derived from him to that purpoſe: for the law is dead in a ſort, but when it is in the Magiſtrates hand, whoſe power is as it were the ſoule of the law, otherwiſe the law would quickly become deſtructive unto it ſelfe, if every private man might take upon him to ſet the force of it in motion. And therefore though private men know the law never ſo well, yet they may not ordinarily be their owne carvers by it, but muſt be content to receive the benefit thereof from the Magiſtrates hand, otherwiſe our Saviour might ſeeme to aske an impertinent queſtion, *who made me a Iudge or a Ruler over you?* And therefore though the law be the ſtrength of the people, yet the people muſt expect to receive this their ſtrength by the diſpenſation of the ſupreme Magiſtrate and his ſubſtitutes, and not at their pleaſure to carve it out unto themſelves,

ſelves, otherwiſe the office of a Magiſtrate were to little purpoſe in the Common-wealth. But yet this law is to be the rule of government, and as you ſay truly, *if the Government command againſt*, it does you wrong, *if you obey, you do your ſelfe wrong*: and why then doe you countenance thoſe illegall Ordinances, and other commands that are now on foot, which are directly contrary to the knowne law of the Kingdome, and ſo clearely and directly injurious to the Subject? Or why doe you woo the people to obey them, and ſo to become acceſſaries to their owne wrong? And yet let me tell you, as for the ſupreame Magiſtrate, who hath none above him upon earth that can authorize you againſt him, this will by no meanes inferre the lawfulneſſe of a reſiſtance, ſuch a one as is now on foot; for though it be true that if he command contrary to the Law of the Kingdome, he therein doth the Subject wrong, yet hee is not accountable therefore unto us, but unto God, ſince he hath no ſuperiour upon earth that hath corrective power over him; and therefore to his judgement we muſt leave him, who onely is above him, ſince he is acknowledged by Parliament to be ſupreame upon earth in the government of his Kingdomes. That ſaying of one herein may ſeeme much to the purpoſe. *Reges ſi aliquando poteſtate ſibi conceſſa abutuntur, non ſunt à nobis graviter exaſperandi, ſed ubi ſacerdotum admonitionibus non acquieverunt, Domino judicio ſunt reſervandi*: And therefore it is not in the power of any to take up Armes againſt him to force him to doe right, but we muſt learne of *David* to leave them unto God, 1 *Sam.* 24. 12, 15. And though in ſome caſes perhaps you may be ſaid to doe wrong unto your ſelfe, if you ſhould obey the command of the King contrary to the Law; yet it is not ſo in all caſes, for we finde examples, and one moſt authenticall one, of active obedience unto the Magiſtrate, even commanding contrary to Law and right: for we finde our Saviour paying tribute unto the Officers of *Caeſar*, though they required it unjuſtly, and contrary to Law and right, and againſt the liberty of the Subject, as our Saviour intimates, *Matth.* 17. 25. Firſt, there our Saviour ſhewes it to be a freedome belonging unto him, *What thinkeſt thou Simon* (ſaith our Saviour unto *Peter*)

Peter) of whom doe the Kings of the earth take cuſtome or tribute? of their owne children, or of ſtrangers? Peter ſaith unto him, of ſtrangers? Jeſus ſaid unto him, then are the children free. Where our bleſſed Saviour proves that *Cæſar* could not juſtly require tribute of him, as is cleare unto any man of judgement. Well, what doth our Saviour doe then, doth he ſtand upon his termes, doth he ſend *Peter* untothem with an harſh denyall? or command him to draw his ſword and ſet them packing? No, he condeſcends with a *non obſtante* to his owne freedome, notwithſtanding, (ſaith that bleſſed Maſter of obedience, to the ſilencing of all rebellious mouthes) leaſt wee ſhould offend them. What? Why he will have it paid, both for himſelfe and *Peter*, and yet we doe not finde that ſo much was required, but onely of our Saviour himſelfe, as if our Saviour would even almoſt ſupererrogate in obedience: nay, hee will worke wonders but he will doe it. And he that would not doe a miracle to feed himſelfe when he was hungry, by turning a ſtone into bread; yet he will doe a miracle to give us an example of obedience, and to pay tribute to *Cæſar*, though requiring it againſt right, by making a fiſh become his treaſurer, to ſupply his wants for ſo good a purpoſe. The riches of the Sea ſhall be ranſackt for it, rather than he will give the leaſt countenance to diſobedience; and his watry Subjects ſhall pay tribute unto him that was King of Kings and Lord of Lords. That he being now in the forme of a ſervant, might pay it to his vaſſall an earthly Prince, *Notwithſtanding, leaſt we ſhould offend them*, ſaith he to *Peter*, *Goe thou to the Sea and caſt in thy hooke, and take up the fiſh that firſt commeth up, and when thou haſt opened his mouth thou ſhalt finde a piece of money, that take and give unto them for thee and me.* Marke, I beſeech you, though he might have pleaded his liberty, and ſo, as you ſpeak, might ſeeme to wrong himſelfe in condeſcending; yet (ſaith he) leſt we ſhould offend them: *Unicuique licet renunciare privilegio ſuo*, and therefore hee will rather diſpence with his owne priviledge, then give offence by cauſing a diſturbance in the Kingdome, or by making the leaſt ſhew or appearance of diſobedience to Governours, thereby to bring a ſcandall upon

the doctrine that he taught, or upon the Christian religion that he came to plant in the world: from whence for your conversion (if it may be) if not, for your confusion (I doubt it will be) I collect this Observation against yours, That wee may and ought to obey the Magistrate, though commanding against the Law; and so wrongfully, to our owne private injury, where the disobedience is like to be offensive, in causing a disturbance in the State, or scandall in the Church. Will you have the point clearely discussed, take it then thus. The question is, and indeed it is a maine one, how the Subject is to carry himselfe toward His Majestie, in case he command contrary to the Law? I hope I shall give you a right determination of this doubt in these severall propositions. First, I grant it clearely that the King in duty ought not to command any thing contrary to the Law; for the Law is unto the King as the Rule unto the Builder, the Compasse unto the Pilot, the Map or Card unto the Travailer, whereby he ought to gage and square out all his motions and actions of regality and government; and whersoever his operations are disproportioned unto this rule, they are irregular.

2. The command of the King or supreame Magistrate may be said to be against the Law two severall wayes; either so as that it enjoynes me to doe something which the Law forbids me, or forbids me to doe that which the Law enjoynes me. Which is against my duty that I owe unto the Law; or else in that it commands me to doe or leave undone something, which the law gives me freedome not to doe, or not to leave undone, which is against the priviledge that the law allowes me: in the first case I ought not to obey him actively, for the law of the Kingdome is the declared and deliberate will of the supreme Magistrate, and therefore so to obey him, were to disobey him, since thereby (as one hath well sayd) I should disobey his deliberate will to obey his suddaine will, which is unreasonable. Yet in this case I must obey him passively, by submitting unto the punishment that hee shall inflict upon me, at least so farre as to forbeare all forcible resistance.

In the second case, I may and ought sometimes to obey him, since

ſince therein, though he indeed may ſeeme to breake the law in commanding, yet I doe not breake it in obeying, ſith the law though it allow me, yet it doth not tie me to my priviledge, and therefore forgoing it, I doe not contradict my duty to the law, but onely forgoe the liberty that the law gives me, which I may and muſt forgoe (ſometimes at leaſt) that I may obey the command of the ſupreme Magiſtrate, in caſe it may make for the obtaining or preſerving of ſome greater good, or for the prevention of greater evill, then the preſervation of my liberty can recompence. As where the forgoing my freedome or priviledge in my eſtate may preſerve ſome greater good unto my ſelfe, or may make for the peace of the Common-wealth, or for the preſervation of ſome great and notable diſturbance in the State, or where it may further the peace of the Church, or prevent ſcandall from our profeſſion, or impediment from the preaching of the Goſpell, or the like. I prove it thus; Firſt, *à fortiori*, If I ought for theſe cauſes to depart from the liberty which the law of God allowes me, much more then ought I in ſuch caſes to depart from the liberty which I am inveſted in by the law of man; if from my chriſtian liberty, much more from my civill liberty. But the former is cleere, much more then the latter; for there is no man that can reaſonably deny but for peace ſake, and to avoid ſcandall, I ought to diſpenſe with my chriſtian liberty; for this, wee have both precept and example, precept 1. *Cor.* 8. 8, 9. *Galat.* 5. 13. *Rom.* 14. from *verſ.* 12. to the end. Examples wee have too, and thoſe pregnant ones, as that of *Paul* diſpenſing with that liberty which he had in Chriſt from the ceremonies of the law, for peace ſake, and to further the Goſpell, and for prevention of ſcandall, and this wee have both in his practice and profeſſion, in his practice, *Act.* 16. 3. where wee find him circumciſing *Timothy* for peace ſake with the Jewes, and that the Goſpell might not be hindered: and upon the ſame ground wee find him purifying himſelfe, *Act.* 21. 26. and that by the advice of Saint *Iames* and the Elders, his profeſſion you may ſee alſo to this purpoſe, 1 *Cor.* 8. 13. if meate make my brother to offend, I will eate no fleſh while the world ſtandeth,

leſt I make my brother to offend; yea in *Act.* 15. in that famous Apoſtolicall Synod, we finde the Apoſtles, for peace ſake, and to avoid ſcandall, making a conſtitution for the abnegement of that freedome in meates and drinks which the Church had obtained in Chriſt, as you may ſee in that firſt and moſt authenticall decretall Epiſtle which is there recorded, ſent from the Apoſtles and Elders with the whole Church, by the hands of *Paul* and *Barnabas*, together with *Judas* and *Silas*, unto the brethren which were of the Gentiles in *Antioch*, *Syria*, and *Cilicia*, which examples and precepts if they were well conſidered, they would teach us more moderation and charity then is found in too many in theſe dayes, who are ready to turne the Church upſide downe, upon every fancyed inconvenience that they apprehend in the diſcipline or ceremonies of the Church, they cry up liberty, liberty, but in the meane time they make havock of the Church in that that more neerly concernes us, which is peace and unity; whereas the Apoſtles teach us both by precept and example, that wee are rather to part with liberty then peace, and that many other inconveniences, even as great ones as Circumciſion was after Chriſt, may be admitted, rather then the peace diſturbed, or the preaching of the Goſpell hindred. And if wee may and ought upon ſuch termes to part with our chriſtian liberty, then ſurely it is moſt reaſonable that upon the like termes, (*i. e.*) for the peace of the Common-wealth, to prevent diſturbance, to avoid ſcandall, or to make way for the Goſpell, wee ought to depart from our civill liberty; for *ſicut ſe habet libertas chriſtiana ad pacem Eccleſiæ, ſic ſe habet libertas civilis ad pacem reipubl.* And therefore in ſuch caſe the command of the ſupreme Magiſtrate is to be obeyed, though it be contrary to the law, in that that concernes the priviledge or liberty of the Subject. Secondly, this is more preciſely confirmed here by the example of our Saviour, who to avoid ſcandall, obeyed *Cæſars* Officers, and made *Peter* joyne with him therein, although it were againſt his liberty and priviledge, as our Saviour ſeemes to intimate. So it appeares cleerly that our Saviour was free by the law or cuſtome of that Nation, and yet to avoid ſcandall

or offence, he obeyed *Cæsars* Officers requiring tribute of him, though contrary to the liberty of the Subject; and *Christi actio nostra instructio*, you cannot walke more safely then in the footsteps of Christ in those things that concerne either your civill or spirituall conversation: this will be a farre more authenticall guide unto the people, then any rules you can prescribe against it, especially in those things which he did of ordinary dispensation, as this which was not a matter of power but submission, &c. And therefore I may aske, did Christ well or no in paying tribute against the liberty of the Subject, and so in obeying *Cæsars* Officers command against the law of the Kingdome? I doubt not but you will answer, yes, (unlesse you are out of love with him too because he is a King) but here he presents himselfe to us as a subject, well, why than I say unto you, and to every other man, as our Saviour once in another case, πορεύου καὶ σὺ ποίει ὁμοίως, the demand of tribute against the law was sinfull in the Officers, but our Saviours obedience was good and laudable, (as he did all things well) and therefore imitable by us. Thirdly, this will appeare by the rule of reason in three conclusions, which I hope you will not deny: the first is this, That wee may and ought to dispense with our private right, where it cannot likely be preserved without a publique ruine; nature teacheth the arme to expose it selfe to a blow to save the head and the whole body; for the generall safety is alwayes to be preserved afore the particular, though never so neere us.

Secondly, That the preservation of the Church from scandall, or the Common-wealth from division is the preservation of a publique good, and the prevention of a publique evill; and both these are in themselves full as good, or better then liberty, and therefore, especially, when they are enlarged by the advantage of the gratuity of them in respect of a private freedome: and this is according to the rule of charity; for as Mr *Calvin* well hath it, *sicut charitas fidei, ita libertas subjicienda est charitati*: and therefore although it be granted, that where nothing else is to be considered, the Magistrate doth an injury in commanding you contrary to the law of the King-

 dome,

dome, and that you doe wrong unto your ſelfe in obeying ſuch a command; yet if the command enjoyne you nothing that is contrary to the commanding part of the law of God, or the Common-wealth, but onely againſt the permiſſive part thereof, not againſt duty but priviledge, you ought to obey in ſuch caſe rather then give occaſion of ſcandall upon the Church, or bring reproach to your profeſſion, or diſturbance to the peace of the State wherein you live. And in ſuch caſe, your obedience is no wrong to your ſelfe, but your diſobedience a wrong to the Church and Common-wealth.

Thirdly, By way of corollary to prevent an evaſion, leaſt any ſhould object that the publique liberty is endangered by ſuffering entrenchments to be made upon the private. The third concluſion is this, that as publique good is to be preferred afore private, ſo amongſt publique and private goods, peace is more neceſſary than liberty, as that which concerneth the very being of a body is more neceſſary then that which concerneth onely the well being: now that peace concerneth the very being of a State, our Saviour himſelfe ſeemes to inſtruct us, when he tells us, *That a Kingdome divided cannot ſtand.* But we cannot ſay ſo of liberty, and therefore even the publike liberty is to be diſpenſ'd with for publike peace: we muſt diſpenſe with commodities for preſervation of eſſences. Beſides that we have learnt by lamentable experience, that when liberty is built up upon the ruines of peace, it cannot ſtand long upon ſuch a foundation, but is quickly buried in the ruines which it hath made: *Pax eſt cuſtos libertatis*, The peace of the Kingdome is the nurſe and guardian of the liberty and freedome of the State; and if you take away that to preſerve this, it is as if you ſhould pull downe the foundation to inlarge the building: or, as if you ſhould ſend away the nurſe for the preſervation of the childe, or remove the fuell to maintaine the fire. And truly I conceive this rule may be well obſerved, for the diſcovery and prevention of one maine plot of the Devill, who hath beene ever and anon ſetting liberty againſt peace, and expoſed this to ruine by the intemperate deſire of that. This is the ordinary ſtratagem of Satan to ſet Schiſme a-foot in the Church

Church liberty; liberty hath cryed downe peace there. This is the very engine whereby he doth usually convey sedition and faction into the body of the State; liberty, liberty, it that popular voyce, together with a pretence of Religion, whereby the peace of the State hath beene so often demolished and cast downe: for my part I wish there may be a perpetuall contract betweene peace and liberty, but if one must goe, we had farre better part with liberty then peace. And therefore by the way we may note, that they are no better Polititians then they are Christians, that goe about to preserve or recover liberty by Sedition; their first care should be to preserve the integrity of the body, and then that it may be fat and well-liking. And now it is very easie for me to bring it home unto you, since it is as clear as the light. That however the commands of His Majestie have been either with or against the Law of the Kingdome, as concerning matter of priviledge & liberty; the disobedience, and much more the active resistance of you and your party is most clearely, to the great disturbance of the State, yea even almost to the destruction thereof, whither it is still drawing nearer and nearer by that meanes, and how soone it may come to that unhappy period we know not. And it is as cleare, that it hath beene very scandalous to the Church and our profession, and given as much or more occasion to the enemies of God to blaspheme, and exposed the Protestant Religion, yea the whole profession of Christianity, more to ignominy and reproach; and to an *odium* with interesse, than any action, that hath beene publikely carried by the professours of the Protestant Religion, since the Reformation, hath ever done: And therefore you must either professe your selves to be much more wise then our Saviour, which I hope you dare not averre; or to be much more wicked then becometh those that professe to be his Disciples, which I doubt you will not admit. But, I pray you, what commands doe you finde enjoyned you by His Majestie, contrary to the Law of the Kingdome, as concerning the commanding part thereof? or when against the priviledge or liberty that he denyeth to them? If you should aske me the like question on the other side, I beleeve I could furnish you with

store

ſtore of inſtances. Since I take it, it may be eaſily proved, that the whole buſineſſe, and the maine body of that deſigne which is now in hand againſt His Majeſtie, is a baſtard iſſue, and can derive no pedigree from the Law either of God or man to make it legitimate. As for His Majeſtie, He deſires nothing but that Authority to be acknowledged in Him, which the Law hath placed in Him: He deſires to make the knowne Law of the Kingdome the onely rule of His rule and Government. But it is by no meanes ſo on the other ſide, if they can finde any colours from the Lawes that may put any plauſible appearance of legality upon their buſineſſe, well and good: but if not, let the Law cry never ſo loud, A monſtrous headleſſe vote of the diſmembred Houſes of Parliament, or for a need of the Houſe of *Commons* alone, without or againſt the King and the Houſe of *Lords*, ſhall be countenance, though to ſet forward the proſecution of their moſt illegall purpoſes. And to make good their Proteſtation for the maintenance of the true Proteſtant Religion, the Honour and Eſtate of His Majeſtie, the Priviledges of Parliament, the Lawes of the Kingdome, and the Liberty of the Subject; The Proteſtant Religion muſt be ſcorned and reproached, by *Browniſts*, *Anabaptiſts*, and *Atheiſts*; The Honour and State of His Majeſtie muſt be expoſed to the contempt of the vileſt of the people; The Priviledges of Parliament muſt be perpetually trampled on at the pleaſure of ſome few that are predominant in the Houſes, by caſting out the Members, by meere arbitrary Votes, for nothing but becauſe they make uſe of that priviledge which the Law allowes, and the Houſes themſelves begged and obtained of His Majeſtie at their firſt entrance upon their conſultation for a freedome of ſpeech, (nay ſometime a whole ſide as it were of the Houſe of Lords, firſt forced out by terrour and tumult, and then voted out upon meere pleaſure.) And the power and authority of the Houſe of Commons, to a moſt palpable abuſing and betraying of the truſt repoſed in them by His Majeſtie and the people of the Land, reduced to a cloſe Committee of about 15 or 16 perſons: ſome ſtrange deſigne ſure that they have in hand, that they muſt get into ſuch corners, and have ſuch cloudes over them

them to cover it. And they ſay the buſineſſe is made a night-worke too, it ſeemes they dare not truſt the Sunne with it, a fit time to conſult about a worke of darkeneſſe. But they muſt remember either now or hereafter, that there is a light over them that they ſee not, that diſcovers all their ſecrets. There is one ſtill amongſt them that they cannot vote out neither, to whom light and darkeneſſe are both alike, and the night is as cleare as the day. There is an inviſible notary too that takes our records of all their determinations and plots; and truely they had beſt finde him out, and prevaile with him if they can to take an oath of ſecrecy: (which they can never doe) before they proceed any farther in the buſineſſe; for as ſure as they live hee'le reveale all elſe, and a thouſand to one will undoe all their plots by ſome counter-plot or other, and will be as bad as an *Eliſha* to the King of *Syria*, to defeat and diſappoint their moſt ſecret deſignes. They may gueſſe at ſome thing if they will by what hath already fallen out; they have had divers experiments how unproſperouſly their counſels thrive: And therefore methinks Maſter *Pym* might well propoſe that queſtion, that the King of *Syria* did unto his ſervants, upon the ſeverall defeats that hee obſerved to have befallen him in his enterpriſes againſt *Iſrael*. Will yee not ſhew me which of us is for the King? But to ſave him a labour, let him but the next time they meet reade the 12 firſt verſes of the 139 *Pſalme*, and a hundred to one that will be as good as any charme they can uſe to diſcover him who it is that doth thus ſecretly intrude into their counſels, and that doth thus defeat and make voyde all their moſt ſubtile contrivances, ſo that hitherto for the moſt part they have brought forth nothing but winde, though I confeſſe it hath beene a whirle-winde that hath diſturbed and ſhaken the frame both of Church and State. Even the very ſame that defeated the Counſell of *Achitophel* againſt *David*; little doe they thinke how he ſits and laughs at their moſt wiſe plots and contrivances of wickedneſſe. Let them but looke into the ſecond *Pſalme*, and they may ſee him at it methinkes, if they could but put on the ſpectacle of the *Pſalmiſt*. They may there ſee him as it were deriding at them, and laughing at their grave

and prudent madneſſe, whileſt they with ſuch confidence ſit together, as if all the wiſedome in the world were in their breaſts, ſtriving to breake off from themſelves and others, the bonds and cords of the Lords Anointed. Little do they ſee how he blaſts all their conſultations? how he damps all their purpoſes, even as faſt as they give them iſſue: reade *Iſ.* 8. 9, 10.

Oh that they would at length be wiſe indeed, and remember that woe of the Prophet, *Iſ.* 29. 15. *Woe be to them that ſeeke deepe to hide their counſell from the Lord, and their workes are in the darke; and they ſay, Who ſeeth us? and who knoweth us? Surely your turning of things upſide downe ſhall be eſteemed as the potters clay.* But is this to maintaine the priviledges of Parliament, to deveſt the Members of that power and truſt repoſed in them by His Majeſtie and the people, and to commit the managing of the affaires of the Kingdome, to your new device of a cloſe Committee? And to make them not onely the Maſters of the reſt of the Members of the Houſes, and them their ſlaves and ſhadowes; but to make them Lords Paramount over the King and the whole Kingdome, to require oathes of Allegeance unto them, as of late hath moſt inſolently and impiouſly beene done in *London*, (if wee are not miſ-informed:) and to put the lives, liberties, and eſtates of all the people of the Land, into the diſpoſing of a matter of 15 men, that have no ſuch power given them either by King or Subjects; and thoſe for ought we know, neither Angels, nor Saints, nor of the beſt ſort of men, that they may ſacrifice all at their pleaſure to their paſſions; and no man muſt ſo much as aske a reaſon of them, for feare of preſſing into a ſecret of State? Was there ever a Nation ſo befooled? Was there ever a people brought to ſuch a paſſe? Is the famous and flouriſhing Government of this Nation, by the King and the States of the Kingdome under him, brought now to an Oligarchy, a meere uſurpation, a moſt tyrannicall and arbitrary rule of 15 men, that are made as it were abſolute Lords of the Lawes, the liberties, the lives and eſtates of the whole Nation? Sure they have played their cards well, they have ſhewed themſelves excellent projectors; ſo handſomely and undeſcried, to ſet up a Monopoly in themſelves,

ſelves, both of Regall and Parliamentary power; a Monopoly upon the point of all the wealth and eſtates of the Kingdome. They have carried the buſineſſe very cunningly, to bring things unto this paſſe, and when they have done to make ſuch fooles of the poore people (whom they ride in the buſineſſe, and likely enough laugh at them in their ſleeves, to ſee how ſilly and ſimple the poore fooles are to be led ſo gently by the noſe of them) as to get them out of conſcience to undoe themſelves, their wives and children, to furniſh them with money, and to expoſe their lives unto the greateſt dangers, to the loſſe of ſo many thouſands of them: and all to make good their owne bondage and ſlavery to theſe Maſters of the Cloſe Committee. *En quo diſcordia cives perduxit miſeros!* We have quarrelled our ſelves into a pretty condition. But ſhall we be mad ſtill? Have the people of the Land abjured their ſenſes and reaſon with their conſciences? Will they never be weary of ſuch a miſerable ſlavery? Now for the Liberty of the Subject and the Lawes of the Kingdome, you may eaſily gueſſe what becomes of them, when the Priviledges of Parliament are trampled on by their owne feet. *Qui ſibi nequam, cui bonus?* if they make ſo bold with their owne, you may well imagine what they doe with ours. Or where, I beſeech you, is the *Magna Charta*, is not that a Law of the Kingdome? When contrary to the very firſt words of that Charter, the liberties of the Church are profeſſedly invaded, &c. Or what is become of the Petition of Right? which was ſo much talk't of heretofore, when at the pleaſure of theſe men without any due proceſſe at Law, the eſtates, nay, the lives of the Subject muſt be taken away by force and violence: witneſſe the late murder of His Majeſties Subjects at *Briſtol* and at *London* by Martiall Law, (which no Law putteth into their hands, either without or againſt His Majeſties Authority) for that loyall deſigne of theirs to have delivered up thoſe Cities unto His Majeſtie. Or where is the Law for the *Militia*, or for the taking away of His Majeſties Ships and Forts? Or where is there any Law to enable them to command any of the Kings Subjects to take up Armes againſt the King, whoſe Subjects they themſelves con-

feſſe themſelves to be in their language, though they do indeed moſt clearly deny it in their practiſe. Or is it ſubjection to ſeek the ruine of a Princes Authority and His life by open force and hoſtility; if this be ſubjection, I pray you tell me what is rebellion? or why doe they diſſemble with God and man in ſtiling themſelves His Majeſties moſt humble and obedient Subjects, when they are in actuall oppoſition againſt Him, and will neither obey Him nor the Law by which hee governes: if this be ſubjection, *Jacke Cade* had a great deale of wrong, and *Wat Tyler* too. And *Percy* and *Catesby* were a couple of fooles, that they would not come in to juſtifie themſelves to be the Kings humble and obedient Subjects. But it ſeemes it is no wrong at all done by the people to themſelves, when they obey the moſt unlawfull and moſt unreaſonable commands of your party. But if you obey the King againſt the Law, your conſent unto your owne wrong: but we cannot ſo much forget our reaſon as to beleeve it. Or doe you meane to bring in a new reaſon, as well as a new religion? But I beſeech you, what if I am not bound to obey him; nay, what if I am bound not to obey him, as in ſome caſes I confeſſe I am, if His Majeſtie ſhould command me contrary to the Law of God, &c. muſt I needs then take up Armes? no certainly, in ſuch caſe I muſt ſubmit to His Authority, in the willing ſuffering of that puniſhment he ſhall inflict, as is afore-ſaid. Or did our Saviour wrong himſelfe in ſubmitting unto *Pilate*? or did thoſe good Chriſtians in the Primitive times wrong themſelves, when they glorified God ſo much in their chearfull ſufferings upon this very ground. If you may be Judge they ſhall all have actions of the caſe againſt themſelves, and were Martyrs in their owne wrong: indeed I doubt you'le never be guilty of ſuch a ſinne. And ſo I have done with your firſt Propoſition that you propoſe to the Malignants, as you moſt malignantly ſtile them, that are the Kings good Subjects. And now let us ſee what inſtruction you give us in your ſecond, (*Cum bonis avibus*) What is it? The great offence of Authority is whatſoever is committed againſt the State: ſpoken like a Politician. And what is this to your purpoſe. The great offence of Authority you ſay is whatſo-

whatſoever is committed againſt the ſecurity of the State. And I ſay ſo too, and inferre upon it, that therefore that deſigne which you are about, and would juſtifie, is one of the great offences againſt Authority; for what greater offence againſt the ſecurity of the State, then to incenſe a people to rebell againſt their Governour, or to teach them to trample under foot that ſupreame power of the Magiſtrate, and thoſe Lawes of the Kingdome, upon which the ſafety and ſecurity of the State is eſtabliſhed. Talke what you will of the danger and oppreſſion of a tyranny, you may ſee if you will in the fruit of this your bloudy deſigne, that one rebellion and civill warre may bring in more miſchiefe againſt the ſafety and ſecurity of the State, then halfe a dozen Tyrants would likely have done: for ſhew me any Tyrant that ever reigned in this or any other Kingdome, that by his ſingle oppreſſion brought a Kingdome to the ſixth part of that confuſion, that this ungodly deſigne now on foot hath brought our Kingdome unto. Great complaint there was of the tyranny of Ship-money and Loanes, &c. and are they not all reduced? But for my part (I care not who knowes my minde) though I cannot juſtifie the things, nor thoſe that adviſed them, yet I conceive it had beene much better for us to have borne Ship-money, Loanes, Monopolies, and many more oppreſſions, then to have changed thoſe burdens for ſuch a confuſion as is now brought into the State, which is like without Gods great mercy, to end in the ruine and deſtruction of the Nation: And therefore you are no good Counſellor for the ſafety and ſecurity of the State, for though that grand principle which is ſo much abuſed, be admitted for true, That *Salus populi ſuprema lex*, yet I can tell you it will make little for your purpoſe, ſince it is no way for the ſafety of the people, (as you ſee written in bloud before your eyes, upon *Edge-hill*, and at *Braynceford*, & many other places) that they ſhould enabled to take up Armes againſt their Prince, as often as they ſhall fancy, or be perſwaded by any others, that meane to plough with them for a crop to their owne ambition. That the Prince hath broken his covenant with them, or tranſgreſſed the limits and bounds of his Government. The peoples ſafety is never at

greater hazzard, then when it is put into their owne hands: ſhew me a Common-wealth that ever ſuffered ſo much in the gripe of a Tyrant as many have done by the feet of a multitude, & otherwiſe your Obſervation will be turned againſt your ſelf. And your owne penne will condemne you for a great offender againſt the ſecurity of the State, when you incenſe the people to maintaine Sedition: you ſee the Malignants are but little the wiſer for this your ſecond Propoſition.

I come to your third. Heathens tell us, that the wiſe muſt give as much to the Law as may be, but to the Law-giver as little; for (ſayes he) he is a man ſubject to paſſions, may be miſcarried, &c. Had I a minde to cavill, I could quarrell at your Grammer. But let that paſſe: Heathens tell us, you ſay, Well ſaid, it is very well done, Heathens are fit Authors for ſuch an heatheniſh buſineſſe. But yet you muſt deale electively amongſt them, you may not take them all at adventure, ſome are too honeſt to countenance your buſineſſe, and that's not well where Heathens muſt correct Chriſtians. And truely I doubt you have miſtaken your choice here, for what (I pray you) doe theſe Heathens tell you, That the wiſe muſt give as much to the Law as may be, but to the Law-giver as little, becauſe he is a man ſubject to paſſions. What doe you meane by the Law, if you meane the authenticall conſtitutions of the Kingdome, made by the King, with advice of the two Houſes of Parliament. The quarrell is then His Majeſties and ours, who doe complaine that there is too little given unto the Lawes; That they are vilified and deſpiſed, battered downe and demoliſhed by I know not what arbitrary and illegall Ordinances: give you and your party the Law its due, and there will be quickly an end of the quarrell; then the King ſhall have His Rights and præeminences acknowledged which the Lawes doe give Him, and the Subjects ſhall have their rights and liberties made good, and their lives ſecured from plunder and violence, which the Lawes allow them; then thoſe offenders that have violated the Lawes ſhall be brought to condigne puniſhment: Then *Browniſts* and *Separatiſts*, depravers of the Common-Prayer-Booke, and all rebellious and ſeditious people, ſhall have

have their due portions that the Law gives them; and in that diſtribution I doubt you would have little cauſe to rejoyce: Then the *Militia* of the Kingdome ſhall be reſtored into His hands, unto whoſe truſt the Law hath committed it: Then new Lawes ſhall not be made without the royall aſſent of His Majeſtie: Then treaſon ſhall be treaſon againe, and loyalty ſhall be loyalty againe: Then the good Subjects of His Majeſtie ſhall not be impriſoned, or ſpoyled of their goods, or deprived of their lives, without a due and a legall tryall: Then there ſhall be no *Superſedeas'es* ſent out to prohibit or interdict a legall proceeding againſt any routs or riots in *Southwarke*: Then *Habeas Corpus'es* ſhall be granted unto the Subject upon juſt and legall cauſes, without any quarrell againſt the Judges. But alas, that's the cauſe that we groane, that you give ſo little to the Law. I would you were ſo good an Advocate as to perſwade thoſe, whoſe part you ſeeme to act, to re-eſtabliſh the Law in its full and authenticall force; and I thinke the King and his party will aske no more of you. But you deale deceitfully with the Law, as well as with His Majeſtie: you talke much of it; you ſpeake it faire, you give it good words, but in the meane time you make too little account of the force of it, it is with your party no better then *Sampſons* withes or cords, at beſt you uſe it but as a leaden Lesbian rule, bending it and bowing it to your owne purpoſes; and things never go right when the ſtructure is made the meaſure of the rule. But I would faine know what you here meane by the Law-giver, whoſe portion you would have to be ſo ſtraitened, as little as may be to be given unto him. Doe you meane by the Law-giver the King? I thanke you for that then, for ſure that is your meaning. But truely in my opinion you deſerve to be complained of to the Cloſe Committee, for giving ſo much as that ſtile imports unto His Majeſtie, for if the King be the Law-giver, then the Legiſlative power is not in the Houſes, but in the King; for there muſt be but one Law-giver, unleſſe you meane to confound the body of the Common-wealth, (as indeed it ſeemes you doe) and then what will become of your Ordinances of Parliament? Sure you have much to anſwer for for this; neither can I ſee

how

how you will ſlip the collar, unleſſe you ſhould ſay, that by Law-giver here you underſtand the Houſes of Parliament. And then you runne into anorher errour, that will deſerve the Barre; for ſure it will be thought a ſtrange doctrine there, that as little as may be ſhould be given unto the two Houſes, that we may give the more unto the Lawes. It will ſeeme then that you would have them regulated by the Lawes, and not to be left unto ſuch a God-like power of arbitrary rule, as ſome ſeeme to affect. Sure this was not well conſidered, otherwiſe Maſter *Glyn* might have beene ſent upon another meſſage unto you, then to give you thankes for your Sermon, even to have required you to make a recantation, and the Order before your Booke ſhould have ended there. That no man ſhould preſume to print your Sermon, and then *Andrew Crooke* might have had the more leiſure; but I ſee wiſe men may ſleepe. Indeed we may ſee plainly here, how they that ſhoot upward againſt God or his Subſtitute, make a marke of their owne heads: and here you may note too what a ſcurvy ſcab this conſcience is, that will ſpeake interlocutory truths for us, even a-fore wee are aware, even when we are bent to the moſt contrary falſhoods. You might have done well to have lookt a-fore you had leapt into this *Dilemma*, if you had beene more conſtant in your errours they might perhaps have paſſ't the better. But this reeling ſhewes you to be drunke, whether with malice or ambition, or popularity, I know not: you cannot walke ſteedily it ſeemes, a giddineſſe that many of your ſide are ſicke of. Now you are on one ſide, now on another; ſo here you have clearely forſaken your rote, and reeled cleane over the gutter to the other ſide. However you would be underſtood, you are a very Royaliſt in this, though indeed you confound your ſelfe too by contrarieties even in the ſame period, ſo that I can ſcarce tell what to make of you, neither do I beleeve you very well underſtood your ſelfe. Do you meane the King muſt have as little as may be given to him? then you acknowledge the King to be the Law-giver, and that the Legiſlative power is in Him. Or doe you meane the Houſes of Parliament by the Law-giver? then by your doctrine the Houſes of Parliament muſt have as

little

little given to them as may be. See how you are caught in your owne ſpring, ſee *Pro.* 18. 7.

But your good meaning may perhaps ſave you from the bar, greater faults than theſe have been look't over, in thoſe in whoſe affection the Houſes have confided. They and we too know your meaning well enough, your meaning is, that the King muſt have as little as may be given unto him, and perhaps you will leave the honeſt Philoſopher to anſwer for the terme of the lawgiver: but then you muſt have ſomething to ſay for the application. But let's goe. And I pray you tell me then, would you have the King have leſſe than he hath? I hope thoſe good men whoſe advocate you are, by this time have done their endeavours to have left him a pretty naked Majeſtie. They have taken a good competent care, that his Highneſſe ſhould not ſurfet, either of revenue, or authority. They have not only beene frugall in their gifts, or indeed in their no gifts: but they have done the beſt they could to purge him of all ſuperfluities. Good faire attempts have beene made by ſome to have drawne out his very blood. As long as his Majeſtie hath ſuch carefull Phyſitians, you need not feare his being Plethoricall. But why doe you ſpend time and Paper? briefly, ſir, you may know this: That his ſacred Majeſtie (whom we believe againſt all thoſe ſlanders, and blaſphemies that have beene raiſed againſt him) hath profeſſed his intention to governe by the lawes only. And we find not that he deſires any other power than ſuch as the law gives him, and his anceſtours have quietly enjoyed, and ſuch as may enable him to give life unto the law, if this be ſo then, for ought I know, the more we give to the King, the more we give to the law: and the more unto the law, the more unto the King: if this be not ſo, prove the contrary, for they that are wiſe will not take your jealouſies for proofes, yea with his Majeſties favour, I durſt almoſt be bold to lay him before you at your mercy thus farr. Take not from the law of the Kingdome, and ſpare not the King, take as much from him as you can. But then you muſt leave him as much as the law allows him, and I am confident he will be well content with it. Indeed the Philoſopher was wiſe and honeſt in

his rule, and puts us in minde, that the ſafety of a State doth much depend upon this, That all caſes as neere as may be, that fall under conſideration in Government, ſhould have their cleer, full, and poſitive rules ſet downe in the received lawes of the common-wealth, wherby they are to be ruled and managed, that as little as poſſibly may be may be left to arbitrary government. Where the rule of the magiſtrate is only his owne will and judgement which is ſubject to be miſguided by paſſions, which the law is not lyable unto. And we finde not but that this is his Majeſties earneſt deſire; Perſwade you if you can the houſes of Parliament to joyne with him in theſe deſignes by leaving of all arbitrary government, by ordinances or otherwiſe, in oppoſition to the knowne conſtitutions of the Kingdome, and then you need goe no further for an umpire. The law will be the dayes man of this great quarrell, and will ſend every one home in peace with his owne portion. The King, the Parliament, the Subject ſhall have all their owne. The King ſhall be the ſupreme governour: The Parliament the great Councell: The Subjects ſhall have their lives and liberties ſecured, excepting only ſuch as have forfeited their titles. And God ſhall have his ſervice duely and peaceably performed. And then inſtead of a deformation of the Church, and a deſtruction of the Common-wealth, we may have a full and happy reformation of the one, and a reparation of the other, *Quod faxit Deus*. And I intreat you in the meane time to remember, that the houſes of Parliament are neither Gods, nor Angels, ſure ſome of them are men ſubject to paſſions as well as others, otherwiſe there would never have beene ſuch doing and undoing as there hath beene, no nor halfe that adoe amongſt us that there now is. And therefore I pray you intreat them not to challenge abſolute power to themſelves, but that they as well as his Majeſtie may make the lawes their rule too, for there is ſome doubt made, I can tell you, that ſome of them are carried, and ſo may be miſcarried, by more paſſions than their owne, or elſe aske the Londoners. Give me leave only to mind you of one thing more, and I have done with this propoſition, That if there be little to be given to the Law-giver, by that wiſe rule of the hea-

then

then, ſurely much leſſe is to be given to the Subject, and then your propoſition is not much for your turne. Hitherto you ſee you edifie but little, the malignants may be as malignant as ever for ought you have ſaid yet, for their converſion.

But perhaps there's more weight behind: well, we'll endeavour to poyze it if there be, let us ſee then what's your fourth propoſition.

The law ſay you is the common ſurety betweene the King and the ſubject. I ſay ſo too, and wiſh its credit had beene ſo good that its word might have beene taken ſomething better than it hath beene, it might have beene better ſecurity both to King and Subject, as ſome thinke, than the publike faith: I pray you reſtore it unto its credit if you can, and the King will be no looſer by it, no nor the ſubject neither, But to helpe our dull underſtandings you tell us what you meane, when you ſay the law is the common ſurety, *&c.* that is to ſay (ſay you) it binds me to pay the King tribute, That's ſtrange, why doe you not doe it then, and perſwade others thereunto? Sure you nodded here, you had late up late about the contrivance of theſe propoſitions, ſo zealous were you for the good of the poore fooliſh malignants if they would but be guided. And here your eyes grew heavie, and your pen it may be for want of their guidance, fell a wandring towards the truth, for you ſeeme here to ſpeak here in the perſon of a ſubject. And your ſenſe is equivalent to this, that the law bindes the ſubject to pay the King tribute, what is it then I beſeech you tell me, for though I am a malignant I am willing to learne, what is it I pray you that bindes or allowes the Subject, not only not to pay the King tribute, but to rob him of his revenue, to interrupt his rents, to make ſeizure of his goods, to ranſack & make ſpoyle of his exchecquer? Do you know what you have ſaid, or whom you here accuſe, ſurely if the law binde the ſubject to pay the King tribute, there is no law that allowes the ſubiect to rob him of his rights. Nay, you are not content with that neither, but you ſay it bindes you to pay the King tribute, *&c.* What? are you mad now? Take heed of that I beſeech you, why, as ſure as can be, you are hired by the malignants to plead the Kings cauſe under pretence of op-

poſing him. Doe you not yet know what a danger us thing an &c. is? certainly you ſtole this out of the late Canons. The Law bindes you to pay the King tribute &c. why in this &c. you may binde the ſubiect to pay obedience too as well as tribute, and ſo bring in the hereſie of the Chriſtians amongſt us again, and root out that wholeſome doctrine of the Galileans. Nay, by this &c. you may take off the edge of all thoſe ſwords that are lifted up againſt him, I pray you bethinke your ſelfe, hath not the Correctour of the Preſſe abuſed you? you may doe well to get an order for the turning him out of his place if he hath, for this is directly the language of Aſhdod as ſome thinke: but we take it indeed to be the language of Canaan, if it be rightly interpreted, and the very ſenſe of our Saviour: ſure you forgot what you had lately written out of your heathen: That this lawgiver muſt have as little as may be given unto him. But perhaps, you'll make him pay deare enough for it, and that ere you have done, he ſhall have little reaſon to brag of your bounty. I confeſſe I thinke ſo. Well but how doe you make amends? why you have bonds for the King too. I pray you let them be golden chaines, and then I doubt not but he'll be willing to weare them. *The law* you ſay, *bindes the King that I ſhall enjoy my protection*, your meaning is that the *ſubject* ſhall enioy his protection, for I hope you doe not meane to monopolize protection, your ſenſe then is, *that the King is bound by the law to protect the ſubject*, take heed then you prove not a rebell, for then I ſhall tell you, that your propoſition will not hold in thoſe termes that you render it. The King is not bound to protect rebels, but the ſubiect he is, I doubt not but he'll confeſſe it; yea, I am confident would moſt willingly yeeld it. But I pray you miſtake not: the law bindes the King, ſo that in dutie he is bound to performe it, and if he doth it not he is anſwerable unto God for it, who will moſt certainly bring him to an account. But let me tell you withall once more for your inſtruction, that he is anſwerable unto God alone, ſince he who is acknowledged to be ſupreme Governour, and only ſupreme Governour in all his dominions, hath none other above him but God alone, nay none in his dominions equall unto him. And

ſure

ſure, they that are below him have no power to judge him, and if not to judge him, neither to correct him, or who I pray you, hath made the ſubject his ruler? or is a Common-wealth reverſed now the onely faſhion for a State? what authority hath the inferiour to call the ſuperiour to an account? doth the Steward uſe to call the Maſter to a reckoning? or where is the Tribunall, at which the King muſt be judged? Or in whoſe name ſhall the Indictment be made againſt him, or the Writs goe forth for the execution of judgement? Or what if the King pleaſe to grant himſelfe a pardon, ſure you muſt ee'ne be content to leave the King unto the judgement of the Lord, yea, and to leave his heart unto his guidance too. The laſt refuge of the Subject is to make his complaint unto God: And Kings have reaſon to take good heed how they give occaſion of ſuch complaints, for they are like to meet with an impartiall Judge, that regardeth not the perſon of Princes. But for the Subject to take upon them to force the King their ſupreame Governour to his duty, or to take upon them to correct him, is to thruſt into Gods office, who is King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, the onely ruler of Princes. See whoſe property this is, *Revel.* 1. 5. & 17. 14. & 19. 16. See whoſe vertue it is that hath that name written upon it *King of Kings, and Lord of Lords.* And take heed how you goe about to cloath any other in his garment, or to part it amongſt any: Or how you inveſt any other with His Authority, for He will not give His glory to another. But alas His Majeſtie is very hardly dealt with: He is required to protect His people, and yet he is not allowed that Authority, or Power, or Revenue, which is requiſite thereunto. They doe all they can to diſarme Him, and then require Him to defend them. They binde His hands, and when they have done they quarrell with Him, that He doth not uſe them in his defence; is not this a very Egyptian oppreſſion, to bid him make Brick without ſtraw, or indeed rather it may ſeeme to be a meere jeere of his Majeſtie, but they had beſt take heed how they mock at Gods Subſtitute. This I hope may ſerve for your fourth propoſition. Your fifth and laſt is definitive. And you give us the character of a good Subject in it:

In a word, he is a good ſubject (ſay you) *that lookes upward, to ſee what in God, Gods Vicegerent commandeth*; and ſecondly, *That lookes downeward, to ſee whom the obedience thereunto doth either hurt or hinder.* Why, now it ſeemes you would teach them to looke a ſquint, for he that lookes upward and downeward at once muſt needs doe ſo: but however I obſerve, that you would have the ſubject have his eyes about him, that he may looke and ſee. And ſo would I: it is my prayer unto God, that he would open the eyes of the ſubject, of you, and all the reſt, that they may ſee in this deſigne againſt his Majeſtie and themſelves, how they runne headlong upon their owne ruine. And I wiſh they may ſee with their owne eyes, and not with the eyes of other men only, to take all things upon truſt that ſhall be impoſed upon them magiſterially, by thoſe that ſeeme to deny the uſe of reaſon. Secondly, I obſerve, that you would have them firſt looke upward, and ſo would I, and to ſee what in God the Lords Vice-gerent doth command. And whereſoever any thing is commanded by the Vicegerent contrary unto the Lords command, I adviſe them take that counſell of the Apoſtles, rather to obey God than men: but yet in ſuch caſe, I adviſe you and them according to the example of the Apoſtles to ſubmit by paſſive obedience, where they cannot by active performance of his commands. Thirdly, I obſerve that the King according to your confeſſion is *Gods Vicegerent*, and therefore to deſpiſe him is to deſpiſe God, and therefore none can deveſt him but God, whoſe ſubſtitute he is. Fourthly, you would have the Subiect *looke downward too, to ſee whom the obedience to the Superiours command doth either hurt or hinder.* I am afraid there hath beene too much *looking downeward* to worldly ends and purpoſes, to private aymes and contrivances, which have made us forget our duty to God and his ordinance, and our regard to the publique ſafety. And this is the ground of all our miſchiefe, and this looking downeward is no good poſture, if we beleeve the Pſalmiſt, *Pſal.*17. 11. But yet I would have them to looke downeward too in a good ſenſe; and firſt in humility with the *Publican*, and ſecondly in Chriſtian charity with the good *Samaritane*, that with a Chriſtian warineſſe they

may

may as much as lies in them frame their obedience to the good of others; but not ſo as to take upon them the power to moderate the commands of their Superiour, as if whereſoever they ſhall be pleaſed to fancy an inconvenience, either to the publique or any private concernment, it ſhould be in their power to deny obedience; for that is the Governours charge, to looke hee commands nothing that may diſadvantage the Commonwealth, or any part or member thereof: it is not for every private man, nor indeed for any to be the Judge of that, otherwiſe there could never want pretences for diſobedience. There can hardly be found any ſuch inconvenience that can be anſwerable to that ſucceſſion of miſchiefe that is like to accrue upon the diſſolution of Government; or the expoſing the Magiſtrates command unto the examination of the rude and ignorant multitude, ſo as to enable them to reſiſt where they ſhall dreame of ſome hurt or hinderance that may therein accrue unto others, or themſelves. We muſt remember here that the fifth Commandment is the firſt of the ſecond table: And that that is indeed the guardian of all the reſt, and the Kings Throne ſtands higheſt there, even at the very foot-ſtoole of the Throne of God, which is ſet up as it were in the firſt Table of the Law. And therefore ſo that we doe not any act that lieth contrary unto the reſt, wee muſt be content to ſuffer and leave conſequences to God; however, you cannot bring in active reſiſtance or rebellion to the definition of a good Subject. So I have done with your Propoſitions, and come to your confirmation of this laſt. You tell us that Papiſts grant you this, (and your margent points me to *Bellarmine*) That in the Superiour three things are concurrent. 1. The place, which is from Chriſt alone. 2. The perſon, which is from the chooſers. 3. The union of theſe two, which is from Chriſt, but by the mediation of a humane act; let Proteſtants then, ſay you, have their eyes in their fore-head. I could anſwer you very briefely, by excepting againſt the force of your argument, which ſeemes to runne *à majori*, as if what Papiſts ſay in derogation from Magiſtrates, muſt much more be granted by Proteſtants; or as if they gave more unto obedience then we, which is no ſuch matter; for I would

would have you know, that maugre all your seditious doctrines, it is yet the glory of the true Protestant Church, which neither you nor Papists shall ever deprive us of, that we according to the judgement and practise of Christ our Master, and the Apostles our leaders, and the Primitive Christians, are the best maintainers of obedience to Kings and Magistrates; and herein we leave behinde us both Papists and Schismaticks, as two kindes of Foxes tayled together with firebrands of Rebellion betwixt them. And therefore you must not thinke to drive us from our station, by telling us, that Papists yeild this or that. We abhorre Popery in this and all other points: Doe not you know that the Throne of the *Romane* Antichrist must be built up upon the ruine of the civill Authority of Emperours and Princes? take heed you play not his game for him. The truth is, you may be ashamed to lay such a scandall upon the Protestant Church, as to give Papists the precedency in point of Allegeance. I doe here in the name of the whole Protestant Church of *England* enter my Protestation against your admission, and doe avow it to be clearely against the tenet of the true Protestant Church: That Subjects may upon any pretence take up Armes against their lawfull Prince. If any that have called themselves by the name of Protestants have said or done any thing to the contrary, we doe so farre disclaime them. Your miscarriages in this point have brought a scandall and reproach upon the name of Protestants, and have opened the mouthes of Papists against us, as if we were countenancers of Rebellion, and all becaufe we through (I was about to say) too much charity, have tolerated such as you are amongst us. It is you Schismaticks, not we Protestants that have given this occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme; it is you that like *Simeon* and *Levi* have made us, as much as in you lyeth, even to the stinke amongst the Inhabitants of the world, when even Papists, Turkes, and Heathens are ready it may be feared, to lay your mischievous opinions and ungodly practises upon us, as if Protestants were patrons of Rebellion: which we doe abhorre from the very bottomes of our hearts. Witnesse the cleare Article of our Church of *England*.

And

And therefore it matters not to us what Papiſts ſay or doe in this point, it hath beene an old quarrell betweene Papiſts and us, and you may even goe and ſhake hands with them in this point. And yet I ſee not what great advantage *Bellarmine* gives you, in that you here quote out of him, I could direct you to ſome others of them that ſpeake much more plainly to your purpoſe; and it ſeemes you are yet but a novice in the ſtudy of Rebellion, that you are furniſhed with no more pertinent authorities, for what I beſeech you doth *Bellarmine* grant you here? truly all is ſcarce worth thankes for ought I ſee. 1. The place is from Chriſt alone, then take heed how you deſpiſe the authority of that place or office which is derived from Chriſt. 2. The perſon is from the chooſers, it may be in ſome ſort true in elective Kingdomes: but I pray you remember that the Crowne of *England* is ſucceſſive and hereditary, and therefore none but God is the chooſer here, ſo that the perſon is from him too. 3. The union of theſe two is from Chriſt, but by mediation of an humane act. What then though it were granted, this would make little for your purpoſe, for if the union betweene the perſon and the place be from Chriſt, let what humane act ſoever intercede, none but he that makes the union may take upon him to make a ſeparation, if that rule of the Apoſtle be authenticall, *Thoſe whom God hath joyned let no man put aſunder.* Beſides, by this act they ſet him above all their owne power, and doe part with that very power unto him which was before in them, in deſigning him for their ſupreame Governour, and you muſt ſhew ſome ſuperiour authority to enable the doing of ſuch an act. And now let Proteſtants have their eyes in their fore-heads, and ſee how groſſely you paralogiſe, to deceive both your ſelfe and others. Did you not finde that the people are mad already, a man might thinke you would ſcarce venter ſuch ſtuffe amongſt them. But let Papiſts and Schiſmaticks hold what they will at their perils, we Proteſtants by Gods grace will live and die in obedience unto God and our Gratious Prince, whom God long preſerve, to the peace of this Kingdome.

The fourth Conſideration you ſay is criticall. I leave you

to make good the ſenſe of this title, which for my part I am not ſo good a critick to underſtand very well. But to the matter. And herein you ſeeme to lay downe one exception of the people againſt the employment of their eſtates in this preſent bloudy buſineſſe that you plead for, and thereto you returne your anſwers, *My money ſhall not helpe to kill men*; that you ſet downe as the voyce of the ſquint-eyed multitude as you call them. And now let us ſee your anſwer; and indeed here you are liberall, that you may teach them to be ſo: you give them two anſwers for failing, and it was but need of your bounty, for both will ſcarce make up halfe a good one; one ſix pence would have beene better then two ſuch ſlips, but what you want in weight it ſeemes you would make up in number. And firſt you tell them, *Their money is none of theirs; if the Lord, the Law, the Liberty, the Cauſe, or the Defender thereof ſtand in need thereof, no more then the Aſſe in the Goſpel, or the bread and beefe of* Nabal. *Theirs in the like caſe.*

Secondly, you tell them, that *If they hinder the killing or quelling of thoſe who would both kill and quell you, yours, your Religion, Kingdome, they become friends of Gods enemies and yours: and reſolve to make peace with them, with whom God is reſolved to have warre.*

In your firſt anſwer your *Theſis* is true. But it will trouble you to make good your *Hypotheſis*; neither are your prooſes ſo cleare and pertinent. I ſhall endeavour to diſplay your argument thus.

1. You lay downe this for a ground, *That where the Lord, or the Law, or the Liberty, or the Cauſe, or the Defenders thereof have need of our eſtates, private mens purſes are none of their owne*: That's the meaning of your *Theſis*.

Your *Hypotheſis* you tearme to be underſtood, and if you ſpeake any thing to the purpoſe, it is this.

But in the preſent deſigne againſt His Majeſtie, the Lord, the Law, the Liberty, the Cauſe, and the Defenders thereof have need of the peoples money; and therefore as the caſe now ſtands, Their money is not theirs, their property ceaſeth, they have no power to deny.

Your

Your Theſis you make good by two examples or preſidents of holy Scripture, The firſt, out of Matthew 21. 3. where we find *the Aſſe delivered up for the ſupply of our Saviours neceſſity, to furniſh him for his journey to Hierusalem.* The ſecond out of the 1 of Samuel the 25. and the 11. where we find *David in his neceſſity deſiring ſupply of Nabal, and being denyed by that unthankfull churle, going about to revenge himſelfe upon him by a reſolved plunder, and deſtruction of Nabal and his family.*

1. Give me leave to ſay ſomething unto your Theſis, and to examine your proofes, and then I ſhall ſhew the vanity and falſhood of your hypotheſis.

And firſt I grant you this with all my heart, that every one is bound to part with his private eſtate where the Lord cals for it, or hath need of it, either for the procurement of his glory, or for the ſupply of the neceſſity of the Church, or his poore members, or where the exigency of the publique requires it, for the maintainance of the law, the liberty, or the publique good: for the defence of a good cauſe, and the aſſertours of it, and whoſoever doth not part with their eſtates in a due proportion being legally required, preferring the publique good before their private commodity, ſinnes: for the Word of *God* teacheth us, that the Lord is the chiefe proprietary of the whole world, and that of him we hold all that we have, and are but Stewards of it to his uſe, and for his glory. And nature it ſelfe teacheth us, that the good of the parts muſt yeeld unto the neceſſitie of the whole body: and we find the parts of the univerſe, though ſenſeleſſe and irrationall, putting this rule in practiſe: as they are ſwayed in their motions by the inviſible hand of divine providence in the government of the world, ſince even the ſenſeleſſe creatures and elements of the world, are content to forget their owne private good, and to forſake their proper motions, to procure and maintaine the integrity of the univerſe, ſo for the prevention of a vacuum or emptineſſe, wherein the integrity of the univerſe is concerned: we finde that water will forget it ſelfe and its owne proper motion, and aſcend upward, and aire will become retrograde, and deſcend downeward; and I could wiſh we that are rationall creatures

had learnt this a little better than we have, publike matters would not then have beene carried with the private ſpirits of ambition and revenge, as it may be feared, they have beene too much in our dayes, which hath too great a ſhare, it is thought, in our preſent diſtempers: publike aymes procure unity. But diſſentions are uſually the broode of private reſolutions. But yet give me leave to put in a little caution, leſt there ſhould be ſome miſunderſtanding of the matter, and to deſire it may be received *ſano ſenſu, & cum grano ſalis*, for though all that bee moſt true, yet give me leave to put you in minde, that the neceſſity of others or of the publike, doth not deſtroy the proprietie of the ſubject, for we muſt diſtinguiſh here betweene the power that a man hath over his eſtate, and the duty that lies upon him in the mannaging thereof. A man doth not alwayes looſe the power of a proprietary over his eſtate, where his duty engageth him to part with it. I am bound in duty to relieve every poore man that I find to ſtand in need of my help, and to part with my eſtate unto him according to my ability, and his neceſſity, but yet I have ſtill a property in my goods, which I ought ſo to impart, untill I have alienated them by gift. Otherwiſe you will authorize every one upon pretence of neceſſity, to become carvers unto themſelves of other mens eſtates, which would be a fine colour to make violence and plunder become authenticall, and to take away the thankes of charity and almes, contrary to the Apoſtles Doctrine, *Philemon* the 14. who though he had need of *Oneſimus* to miniſter unto him in his bonds, yet he would not doe it without the conſent of his Maſter, that the benefit of *Philemon* therein unto him, might not be as it were of neceſſity, but willingly. And in the 9. of the ſecond to the *Corinthians*, at the 7. verſe, ſpeaking of the miniſtring to the neceſſity of the Saints, hee doth not take vpon him to raviſh a ſupply from them, but leaves it to every man to doe it, according as he purpoſeth in his heart. So let him give, ſaith he, not grudgingly or of neceſſity, for *God* loveth a cheerefull giver. Yea and Saint *Peter* in the 5. of the *Acts*, notwithſtanding the neceſſity of the Church, at that time, yet he allowes *Ananias* and *Saphira* to have had a pow-

power and propriety in their lands, untill they had ſold them, and profeſſed the alienation of the whole price thereof unto the Church, *Acts* 5. verſe 4. whiles it remained, ſaith Saint *Peter* to *Ananias*) was it not thine owne, and after it was ſold, was it not in thine owne power? A pregnant place, not only for the purpoſe we now ſpeake of, but alſo for the quaſhing of that pernicious doctrine that is thought to be too buſie in the world, as though none but they whom ſome men pleaſe to ſtile the children of God, had any right or propriety in their eſtates, but that they may rob them at their pleaſure as Egyptians, or defraud and coſen them how they liſt in their dealings, ſo that they deal uprightly with the brethren. A fine trick of the Divel, to teach men to coſen and cheat in ſinceritie: whereas we finde here, the Apoſtle S. *Peter* allowes *Ananias* and *Sapphira*, though wicked and ungodly people, and none of the true profeſſours of the Goſpell, yet I ſay, he allowed them a propriety in their land before it was ſold, and in the price of it after it was ſold, and ſuch an one, that the neceſſity of the Church could not make void: had they not declared their conſent to an alienation, than indeed the keeping back of any part was both Sacriledge and diſſimulation with the Holy Ghoſt: Sinnes that I would wiſh you and your party to take heed of. And if the neceſſitie of the Church doth not deſtroy proprietie, ſo neither doth the neceſſity of the Common-wealth, but where conſent of the owners, either expreſſe or implied doth ſome way goe along with it, And yet in both theſe and other ſuch like caſes, all men in duty are bound to part with their eſtates: neither doth either of the preſidents you bring out of Scripture, inferre any thing more than I here ſet downe. Though indeed if they had any thing more in them: we know there was that extraordinarie in them, that might very well exempt them from being preſidents for us to follow: in the former, we finde the mediate Authoritie of our Saviour who is Lord paramount of the whole world, and the chiefe and abſolute proprietarie, if I may ſo ſpeak, of all mens poſſeſſions: who are but tenants at will under him. And therefore that divine power in him that gave away by expreſſe donation the goods of the Egyptians

unto the Iſraelites, might well challenge what he pleaſed unto himſelfe, notwithſtanding all private right that any other had in it ſubordinate unto his. And for *David* we know it is poſſible there might be ſome ſinne in his attempt, deſigned upon Nabals goods, as it is cleere enough, there was in his reſolution for his deſtruction, as you may well gheſſe by that thankſgiving that he returnes unto God, for ſending Abigail to ſtay him from his purpoſe. 1 *Sam.* 25. 32, 33. or if not ſo; we know *David* was a Prophet ſubject to extraordinary motions of the free ſpirit. And you muſt take heed how you make all ſuch examples your preſidents, leſt with Sampſon you pull downe the houſe upon your heads, to be avenged of your enemies, *Opera liberi ſpiritûs non ſunt trahenda in exempla communis vita.* But we finde in both theſe examples ſtill a propriety acknowledged in the owners. And therefore wee reade in Saint *Lukes* relation of the ſame paſſage with that of *Matth.* 21. 3. That the owners thereof ſaid unto them, what doe you looſing the Colt? neither doe we finde that our Saviour gave the Diſciples commiſſion to take the Aſſe or the Colt by force, but he tels them, that upon their declaration of his neceſſity they would ſend them. And he by his divine power as you may ſee, plainly there inclined them to conſent thereunto, and you know, *volenti non fit injuria.* There was no deſtruction of propriety for ought I finde, but a voluntary conſent of the owners to ſupply the neceſſity of our Saviour. And for that paſſage about Nabal, 1 *Sam.* 25. 11. we doe not finde but that *David* in his meſſage doth leave Nabal a propriety in his goods, notwithſtanding all the neceſſity that he was in, or what elſe you can obſerve; though perhaps in his paſſion upon Nabals refuſall to relieve him, he might ſet upon a deſigne deſtructive thereunto. But paſſionate undertakings are no good rules. And therefore it is more ſafe for us, to gather inſtruction from *David* in his coole blood, before he was put into a heat by Nabals churliſhneſſe. And then we ſhall finde clearely, that he acknowledgeth Nabal to have a right in his goods. And he deſires a ſupply of courteſie and bounty, doth not challenge it as of right and debt: and therefore he intreateth, not demandeth, *I pray thee*: and what doth

doth he intreat? not a payment, but a gift. Give I pray thee. And what? not what *David* pleaſeth, but what *Nabal* ſhall thinke fit. You may know him to be a beggar in that he is no chooſer: *Da quæſo quod obvenerit manui tuæ ſervis tuis*, Give I pray thee whatſoever commeth to thine hand, unto thy ſervants, and to thy ſonne *David*. Neither did *Nabals* denyall alter the property, as now ſome may ſeeme to intimate by their practiſe. They will allow man a property to give unto them, but not to deny them, nor keepe to themſelves; if they once deny, they forfeit their property. And ſurely they allow us but a poore intereſt in our eſtates, that yeild us no more power but onely to give them away at their pleaſure, to whom they ſhall thinke fit. Our Saviour allowes a greater priviledge to a propriety, and to underſtand ſomething elſe by it, when he askes that queſtion in the Goſpel, *May I not doe what I will with mine owne.* Where he ſets forth the power that a propriety gives a man over his owne eſtate, which is, that hee may doe what hee will with it, ſo as to exclude force to awe or compell him to the contrary. Though I ſay in duty it is otherwiſe, for ſo men may not doe what they will with their owne, for they are engaged in duty to part with it, to the neceſſities of the Lord in his poore Members in his Miniſtry, in his Service, in his Houſe, in his Church, of the Law, of the Liberty, or the publique cauſe, and the defenders thereof: So that if they deny ſupply unto theſe, they ſinne, and are anſwerable to God for it. But this doth not expoſe them to a deprivation by violence or plunder, by force or compulſion, otherwiſe your argument might ſerve as well for the re-calling of Ship-money. But now it ſeemes the caſe is altered, any thing is of force when it ſerves your turnes; but take heed, you doe not know what may be built hereafter upon theſe foundations that you lay. Wee muſt diſtinguiſh betweene the power of Kings over their Subjects, and their duty; and we muſt diſtinguiſh too between the power of Subjects over their eſtates, and their duty, if we meane to judge aright of either, or to behave our ſelves aright toward either, or that they ſhall behave themſelves as they ought to doe; for we muſt know and they

muſt

must know, that power is larger then duty in both, and duty must ſet limits unto their power, but thoſe limits muſt be ſet by God and themſelves, not by others without them. The power of Kings muſt engage us to ſubjection, either active or paſſive, though they uſe it unjuſtly. The duty of Kings muſt teach them ſubjection to that power of God which is above them, that they may not uſe their power unjuſtly.

And the power of both Kings and Subjects over their Eſtates and Revenues, muſt keepe us from offering any force or violence to deprive them of their properties, though there be good cauſe they ſhould impart them as above-ſaid, without expreſſe or implyed conſent. And the duty of Kings and Subjects muſt teach them ſo to moderate their power of property, as to impart themſelves freely and proportionably to God, his Church, and to the Common-wealth, and to what other exigencies, are juſt and charitable, whenſoever the Lord calls them thereunto by giving them occaſions and opportunities of performance; otherwiſe there would ſcarce be roome left for the free practice of vertue, either in Prince or people in the diſpoſition of their eſtates and powers, if all were to be compelled. But God hath ſo diſpoſed of things in his wiſedome, which for my part I cannot but admire, though I am not able to expreſſe it as I would in this particular. That he hath left men ſome freedome for the practiſe of vertue: So he hath given Kings power to be Tyrants, (I meane ſo farre as that they they are not to be reſiſted by their Subjects) that they may have roome to ſhew their vertue in performing the duties of good Princes. And he hath given Subjects a power to reſtraine their liberality, their charity, &c. to abuſe their eſtates (I meane ſo farre as that others without conſent either expreſſe or implyed, where there is a true and free property, cannot compell them to the contrary) that they may ſhew their free vertue in performing their duties, both in the due imployment, and imparting of their eſtates, that it may be as the Apoſtle ſpeaketh, a matter of bounty, not of covetouſneſſe or neceſſity; and alſo in the due and temperate uſe and husbanding of them, otherwiſe we might turne all vertue into neceſſity. And indeed

hereby

hereby God hath provided for peace, order, and tranquillity in the world, which you and others attempt, even to baniſh out of the world; whileſt either through ignorance you diſcerne not (which in charity I will hope of you) till you make mee know the contrary: or through malice you goe about to remove theſe land-markes, which God hath ſet betweene King and people, betweene one Subject and another; for otherwiſe if Subjects might take upon them to compell Kings to limit their power to what they ſhall conceive to be duty, this muſt needs in all probability open a doore to perpetuall confuſion and rebellion, and the caſe muſt be the ſame betweene the Subjects and Parliaments, as betweene Subjects and Kings, *Et jam veſtra res agitur*, for you can ſhew no reaſon to the contrary, I am confident. And on the other ſide, if others might take upon them to be moderators of my eſtate, and to compell me to impart at their pleaſure, where they ſhall conceive their exigeney requireth, we ſhould hardly ever be free (it may be feared) from ſuch pretences, of neceſſity, *&c.* to countenance continuall intruſions and violent ſurpriſalls of one anothers goods, by this rule every poore man that can plead neceſſity may come and take your purſe for ought I know, and you and hee both had beſt take heed of that; remember here that of *Salomon*, Prov. 6. 30. Men doe not deſpiſe a thiefe if hee ſteale to ſatisfie his ſoule when he is hungry, but if he be found he ſhall reſtore ſeven-fold; he ſhall give all the ſubſtance of his houſe. You may ſee there though he deſerveth favour, yet his neceſſity doth not exempt him from being a thiefe, not from the crime, no nor yet from the puniſhment, (and God doth not uſe to preſcribe penalties where there's no offence) he ſhall be fined in a ſeven-fold reſtitution. And therefore though men be truly engaged in duty to ſupply ſuch exigencies you before ſpeake of, yet this doth not deſtroy their property, as if that ceaſed, as you imply, whenſoever ſuch occaſion or neceſſity is preſent, but obligeth their duty: And therefore in thoſe caſes where you have not or cannot gaine their conſent, you muſt leave them to performe their owne duties, or elſe you will tranſgreſſe yours, whether you be King or Parliament, or a

ſingle Subject. But perhaps you will ſay, that the Parliament hath in them a devolution of all the Subjects propriety, ſo as to diſpoſe of their eſtates to publique purpoſes: if you meane by the Parliament the King and the Houſes, I grant ſo that they doe it by Act of Parliament. And you muſt take in the body of the Convocation (if the Clergy be Subjects, or have any liberty or property) for the diſpoſing of the eſtates of the Clergy.

But if you meane by the Parliament the two Houſes without the King, I deny that they have the conſent of the Subjects for the diſpoſing of their eſtates, ſince they were choſen by the Subjects not to manage the publique affaires of themſelves, but in a Parliamentary manner, order, and motion, to joyne with His Majeſtie, and to doe things by His conſent by Act of Parliament; and therefore ſince they have not His conſent for the diſpoſing of the eſtates of the Subjects, as they now doe: Nor doe it by Act of Parliament, which cannot be without the King. They can plead no conſent of the Subject, who gave them their power onely in that ſenſe, and to that purpoſe as afore-ſaid: If you are rationall you underſtand this, if impartiall & honeſt you will acknowledge it, & give over abuſing the people with your Obſervations. And here the people may ſee who meane beſt unto their properties and liberties, ſince you put us to plead for them, whileſt you oppoſe them for the advantage of your party. And yet will they never open their eyes? but ſtill runne on madding upon their owne ruine. I pray you ſpeake to them to have a little more wit and honeſty: let them have your example, it may be it may worke much with them. But what if I ſhould grant you your *Theſes* in your owne ſenſe?

Yet it will trouble you exceedingly to prove your *Hypotheſis*: you are ſo farre from doing it, that for ought appeares you were aſhamed to mention it. You leave us to collect it, but prove it, I pray you, for your credit is not ſo great that we are bound to take your bare word, though you gave it us never ſo plainly. Prove it then, that the money and goods that is forced by your party from the poore Subjects, is for the ſupply of any of thoſe neceſſities you ſpeake of.

Is

Is it for the ſupply of the neceſſity of the Lord, to maintaine a Warre againſt his Subſtitute, (acknowledged ſo by the *Scots* in their late Petition to His Majeſtie) and directly contrary to Gods command? *Rom.* 13.

Is it for the ſupply of the neceſſity of the Lord, to maintaine practiſes of Sacriledge, demoliſhing of Churches, violating of Sepulchres; to ſet forward a diſturbance of Gods Service in his houſe, to abandon the daily uſe of publike Prayers where they have beene uſed, and whereby God hath received ſo much glory, and the people ſo much comfort, and to bring in prophaneneſſe, or at the beſt to undertake a reformation by a way God allowes not, when it hath beene offered in a peaceable and fit manner? or where doe you finde that the ſword is to be moderator, or that reformation in Religion is to be founded in bloud?

Or is it for the ſupply of the neceſſity of the Law to nouriſh a Warre clearely againſt Law, both in it ſelfe, and in the purpoſe and drift of it? in it ſelfe, as being without and againſt the Kings command, and againſt His Perſon and Authority, who is declared by Law the ſupreame Governour, and ſo the ſupreame Moderator of the Sword in the drift or purpoſe, which we underſtand not at all, if it be not to abridge the King of that preeminence and authority which His Anceſtours have, and He ought to enjoy by the Law of the Kingdome: As the power of the *Militia*, of conſenting or with-holding His aſſent to the allowance or diſ-allowance of Acts of Parliament; of chooſing Privie Counſellors, &c.

Some ſay neceſſity hath no Law, but I am ſure the Law hath no neceſſity of the plunder of mens eſtates to any ſuch purpoſe.

Is it for the ſupply of the neceſſity of liberty of the Subject, that their liberty ſhould be taken away to cure men of their diſeaſes by killing them, or to caſt them into the Sea for feare they ſhould ſuffer ſhip-wracke?

Is it for the neceſſity of the cauſe, or the defenders? what cauſe is it I beſeech you that doth neceſſitate any ſuch thing? is it Religion? have wee not beene Proteſtants all this while?

why doe you not confute the Articles of the Church of *England*? it may be indeed your new Synod will doe it for you. Hath not the truth flouriſhed amongſt us all this while till of late? you your ſelfe ſeeme to confeſſe it, if there be any ſenſe in your words in your next Paragraph as wee ſhall ſee anon. Who is it than that goes about an alteration? might you not have thanks if you would let it flouriſh ſtill as heretofore it hath done, or if any thing be to be mended, hath it not been offered? what's that cauſe then, the neceſſity whereof doth lay ſuch fanges upon the Eſtates of the Subjects? or who are thoſe defenders you ſpeake of. I am ſure I know who is the Defender of the Faith under God; and then remember who it is that you oppoſe: ſurely you had need explaine your ſelfe, for for ought we can yet learn by you, the Subjects have good right to keepe their goods unto themſelves, for any neceſſity that you can plead; it doth neither alter their Property, nor engage them in duty to impart for the maintainance of this diſmall Warre againſt His Majeſty. They are much more engaged to impart them to Him, that ſtands for the defence of the true Proteſtant Religion, together with the Law and Liberty of the Subjects. This is the cauſe, and this is the defender, that may much better plead neceſſity of ſupply.

But you have two ſtrings to your bow, and ſo you had need, for you ſee one of them will not hold. And what's your ſecond? let us ſee what that will doe. *Your money ſhall not helpe to kill.* That's the reſolution of the ſquint-eyed multitude: well ſay you when you meane ill; but what's your anſwer? why you tell them, that *if they hinder the killing, quelling, of thoſe who would both kill and quell you, yours, your Religion, Kingdome. They become friends of Gods enemies and ours, and reſolve to make peace with them with whom God hath reſolved to have warre.* How doe you prove that? why *Exod.* 17. *ult.* what ſaith that place? why, theſe are the words which you leave us to finde out there, for he *ſayd, becauſe the Lord hath ſworne to have warre with* Amalek *from generation to generation.* Go to now, where does your great ſtrength lie? or how may a man doe to bind this *Sampſon* of yours? This invincible perſwaſive

or

or reply, or what you will call it, wherewith you doe ſo unmercifully ſeize upon the judgments of the poore blear-eyed people.

Wee'le examine it a little, Your drift is or ſhould be to ſhew, that the reſolution of the people is not good, that their money ſhall not help to kill in your deſigne, for that muſt be your meaning? now how do you drive them from this reſolution? why thus, you ſhew them very learnedly that their money muſt help to kill, &c. how prove you that? why, becauſe they may not hinder the killing, quelling of them, &c. well, it ſeemes then you are all for killing and quelling, wee might have hoped of more favour, you might have given the people leave to have thought you more mercifull; but is this good Logique? they may not hinder, therefore their money muſt help; is there no meane betweene helping and hindering? conſider it well and you'l finde there is, but that's your weakneſſe, or perhaps your haſt; wee'l pardon it and allow it that force it wants: But how doe you prove they may not hinder the killing, quelling of the Kings Party, for that's your meaning without all queſtion? why, becauſe they are thoſe that would both kill and quell you, yours, your Religion, your Kingdome: wee need your help a little here, wee underſtand you in part, your (Us) there ſtands for your Party I conceive, and your (Ours) for your Wives, Children, Friends, Family, and the like: but we cannot tell yet what you meane by (our Religion) nor very well what you meane by (our Kingdome,) your Commentary here a little I beſeech you; doe you meane by Your Religion the Brownists, or the Anabaptiſts, or the Familiſts, or the Seperatiſts, or the Libertines, or the Papiſts; for it is thought you have of all theſe ſorts in your Party, ſo that your party is very party-coloured; or doe you meane that which wee doubt you have too little to doe with, the true knowne Proteſtant Religion, or what do you meane by Your Kingdome? is this Kingdome any more yours then His Majeſties or ours? or what Kingdome is it that you meane? I preſume you will ſay, that by (Your Religion) you meane the true Proteſtant Religion, and by (Your Kingdome) this Kingdome of *England*, that is ſo

denominated a Kingdome from that good King that God hath ſet over it: and if ſo, then give me leave to aske you firſt, how it appeares to you that the Kings party would kill you or yours, or that they would quell you? doe you but quell your rebellious ſpirits, and I dare warrant you for either killing or quelling by His Majeſty or His Party, if He can help it, any further then the Law armes Him againſt you; nay, you may aſſure your ſelves His Majeſty hath that grace and clemency in Him that will moderate the ſeverity of the Law too, and it is not beſt for you to deny Him that power; you have had good experience of His Majeſties mercy if you would thinke on't: ſome have thought He hath beene cruell to Himſelfe in being mercifull to you; I but I hope all His mercy will returne at length into His owne boſome; you had beſt take heed you ſlight it not too much, leſt if it be kept too long before you make uſe of it, that good and pleaſant Wine turne Vinegre. You may doe well to remember that mercy loves not to ſtand too long at the doore, clemency is not eaſily wearied, but if it once grow throughly angry, it may prove the greateſt fury. If you will needs put His Majeſty to His choice, which of the two He will have ſpilt, He knowes there is difference of price and value betweene rebellious and loyall bloud. And if there be no help for't, but that you will worke your ruine, (the price of the ſafety and preſervation of His faithfull people) you may thanke your ſelves for ſetting up ſuch a Market, I know not how to helpe you, but in truth I ſhall be ſorry for you. But you may prevent it if you will, it is but returning to your obedience and loyalty, and I doubt not but ſhall find His Majeſties ſword that is now moſt unwillingly drawn againſt you for your correction, ready moſt cheerfully to exerciſe it ſelfe in your protection: and ſo you and yours may be ſafe if you pleaſe, and the Subjects may keepe their money for better purpoſes then to imploy it to ſet forward the killing of men; it was ſure ordained for a meanes of preſervation, not for the inſtruments of ruine and deſtruction. *But your Religion your Religion.* That *will be kill'd and quell'd*; if this cry were not in your mouthes I could ſcarce thinke you to be Rebels; for, is not this the u-

ſuall

ſuall accoutrement of rebellion to march under the colours of Religion? at leaſt in pale, or in quarter with ſome others; as liberty perhaps, or ſome ſuch like, becauſe Religion will not of it ſelfe take with all palats; but I pray you doe not beleeve that this vizour will alwayes be undiſcovered: this velvet maske hath beene ſo much uſed, that the nap is all worne of almoſt, and the bare face may be ſeene through it. This pretence of Religion is growne ſo ſtale, and hath beene ſo often made the lure of ſedition, that the very boyes can almoſt ſpy out the impoſture; and therefore your wiſer way will be to get ſome new faſhion for your ſtrumpet, unleſſe you meane to have them throw ſtones and rotten apples at her; alas, this is an old trick to begin miſchiefe in the name of God: *In nomine Domini incipit omne malum*, is too old and too true a ſaying; but let them take heed that ſet it forward in ſuch a ſtile: for this is ſomething worſe then to take Gods name in vaine, and then they are not like to be held guiltleſſe. And amongſt others you had beſt be wary, for whilſt you make God and Religion the ſtile of this horrid buſineſſe, your whole progreſſe is a kind of a running blaſphemy; nay, perhaps I could eaſily ſhow you that in many of you is a running perjury in thoſe that have taken the Oaths of Alleageance and Supremacy; further anſwer I cannot give you ſo fully, as perhaps I might if I did but know what ſtamp you are of, onely this let me tell you, firſt for the Proteſtant Religion, as it hath been for theſe many yeares in this Kingdome, under the ſucceſſive and ſucesfull raignes of three gracious Monarchs without interruption untill now: ſo (if you hinder not) His ſacred Majeſty hath given us good aſſurance, and wee have good witneſſe of it, even God himſelfe, beſides many thouſands upon earth, that it ſhall not be killed nor quelled, but maintained, and if ever any thing fall out otherwiſe, I am perſwaded wee ſhall have to thanke ſuch as you for it, which God forbid. And for thoſe other things that walke under the name of Religious, I hope His Majeſty will by Gods aſſiſtance take ſome good courſe for quelling of them, as well Popery as Browniſme, and the reſt of that rabble, that wee can ſcarce tell what to call: Both God

and

and his good people doe expect from His Majesty, that He will be vigilant for the extirpation of these by all due and lawfull meanes, and that He will not admit of the least shew of a toleration of them; but yet wee doe beleeve His Majesty will finde out more proper wayes than the sword for the rooting out of those errors from amongst us; and if they can be but quiet, and keepe themselves from sedition and corruption of others: it's like His Majesty will shed no mans bloud meerely for His opinion, but will rather take care for the application of the due meanes for their conversion, and so leave them to the mercy of the Lord; for wee beleeve His Majesty hath other principles, and those farre more gracious and god-like, than those that you seeme to walke by. Though he be never so zealous for Gods house, yet wee conceive He doth not think that He should have any thanke from God if He should build up *Sion* with bloud. His Majesty we hope will rather remember that *David* was not suffered to build the Lord a Temple, because his hands had been imbrued in bloud, that the Temple was to be built by a *Solomon*, a King of Peace, and in a raigne of Peace, and in a peaceable manner without all noyse and tumult not so much as the noyse of an axe or an hammer to be heard in that holy businesse, much lesse of a Sword or Speare, or of those thunder-emulating instruments which have beene the brood of cruelty of these last times of the world: wee beleeve His Majesty will not willingly make use of any such instruments as these in that worke, unlesse the malice of the adversaries compell Him to it. Indeed it may fall out, that *Sanballat* and *Tobiah*, with their complices of Arabians, Ammonites and Ashdodites may put *Nehemiah's* work-men to their weapons as well as their tooles, in the building of the Walls of *Jerusalem*, and to set them upon the businesse with a Trowell in one hand and a Sword in the other, that the builders should have their weapons girded by their sides and so build, and that *Nehemiah* may be enforced to set a Trumpeter by him; but this was onely for the defence of the worke, not to offer any violence to any, but to repell it, in case it were offered by any unto them; neither doe wee know of any violence intended

intended of that ſort you ſeeme to ſuſpect, either againſt you or your religion as you call it, be it what it will, if you will be but quiet, and not rayſe tumults in Church or Common-wealth, nor quarrell with other men, becauſe forſooth they will not put out their eyes that they may be as blind as you; if you can but be content to live alone and be quiet, you may if you will needs be let alone and be quiet in your folly, for any matter of bloud or the like. And yet wee beleeve His Majeſty will not let *England* become an *Amſterdam*. Truth ſhall have more encouragement then Errour: it is fit that thoſe dotards that will perſiſt ſhould be made ſenſible, it is mercy not to let them periſh upon too eaſie termes: this is not to cut them off from the clemency of God, but to haſten them unto it, and this may be done without killing I hope; and therefore wee beleeve you fright the people in vaine, and make bugbeares of your owne fancies, when you ſeeme to perſwade them they ſhall find a bloudy perſecution for religion, but I hope they will be wiſer then to thinke it is any good warrant for them to be rebellious; becauſe you are pleaſed to be fearefull and ſuſpicious. It is no wiſedome for them to caſt their goods out of their veſſells, becauſe you are pleaſed to dreame of a ſtorme; they might likely provide much more for their ſafety by caſting out ſuch a rebellious Prophet as you are, that have out-run the errand the Lord ſent you on, & are become a fugitive from his work; like *Jonas*, who when the Lord ſent him to *Niniveh* runnes to *Joppa*, and from thence is bound for *Tarſhiſh*. It were happy for you if ſome ſtorme or other might but ſend you into your right courſe againe. But I would faine have done with you, you cannot make it appeare that the King or His Party hath any mind to kill you or yours, nor to quell the true Proteſtant Religion, no nor yet to divorce you from any of your phantaſies by the ſword, admit any of His Army would, yet I am confident you may looke for more mercy from His Majeſty, and if you hinder not He may have power anſwerable to His goodneſſe; but your Kingdome is in danger, they would quell the Kingdome, who are thoſe I beſeech you? if you will not tell me, I can tell you who they are, even they that go about to demoliſh or

diminiſh the majeſty and authority of the kingly Throne; for ſo much as they take from the power and eminency of the King, ſo much they quell and deſtroy the Kingdome; for it is the King and the regall power that gives it the name of a Kingdome: they than that goe about to turne the King into an empty ſtile, or a meere ſhadow of regality, and to change the regall Government into a popular State, or Ariſtocraticall, thoſe are they that go about indeed to deſtroy the very eſſence of a Kingdome: looke than who they are that are againſt the King and againſt Monarchy, thoſe are they that go about to quell the Kingdome; but perhaps you meane not by the Kingdome this or that forme of Government, but the people and inhabitants; and in this ſenſe, who are they that would quell the Kingdome, but even they that have beene the Authors of this moſt bloudy and unnaturall Warre againſt His Majeſty, that have divided the Kingdome againſt it ſelfe; that have moſt mercileſſely ſacrificed the lives of the poore ſeduced people of the Land, to their paſſionate and ambitious or malicious deſignes; they that have abuſed both Parliament and people, by endeavouring to make them ſlaves to their humorous reſolutions againſt their duty both to King and people; they that have ſtricken at the very foundation of the State and Government, and brought the Common-wealth into a meere Chaos and a confuſion; theſe, theſe are they that would quell the Kingdome, and therefore if you will needs have the people buy bloud, you muſt ſend them to market there; there they may perhaps find ſome within their purchaſe, but royall and loyall bloud is of too great a rate I can tell you, for all the money they have to pay a ſufficient value for the leaſt drop of it.

But yet I am not come to the maine force of your argument. They muſt give their money to help to kill thoſe that would kill and quell you, &c. why? otherwiſe they become friends of Gods enemies and yours, and reſolve to make peace with them with whom God is reſolved to have warre; and you prove it, becauſe *Moſes* tells us, that *the Lord hath ſworne to have warre with* Amalek *from generation to generation.*

Well, than it ſeemes wee muſt needs admit, that all that are your

your enemies *eo nomine*, are Gods enemies: now that wee are no way convinced of, becauſe wee doe finde your cauſe to be Gods, or that you have any commiſſion from him, but rather you have many prohibitions from God, if you would take his word in the holy Scripture, unleſſe you meane with the Libertines to take the warrant of a private ſpirit. And then ſecondly, you ſeeme to hold, that wee muſt all aſſiſt you with force and violence for the deſtruction of your enemies and Gods; how than ſhall the rule of our Saviour be made good, that will have you forgive your enemies, and I ſay unto you reſiſt not evill, which muſt bind all private men from revenge; but you'l ſay the Members of the Parliament are all Magiſtrates, I grant it in ſubordination to His Majeſty; but whereſoever they are found in direct oppoſition to Him, they become ſo farre private in their motions; like the Moone in the Dragons tayle, in direct oppoſition to the Sunne ſhee looſeth her light.

But God you ſay, is reſolved to have warre with them that have warre with you, and therefore the people muſt. Prove that. Why? The Lord is reſolved to have warre with Amaleck from generation to generation; therefore with the King and his partie: for it ſeemes, we muſt neceſſarily believe that you are Iſraelites, and they are Amalekites: but that the people are not ſatisfied of, they muſt therefore looke for better evidence from you to convince them: in the meane time, let me deſire you to take heed how you miſinterpret the Lords oathes, leſt you ſhould ſeeme to taxe God of perjury, as well as ſome bodie hath done the King. And ther's an end of your criticall Obſervations.

And now in the fifth place, you come like an operatour to cure the people of their melancholy: you draw them forth in their ſullen fits, as you conceive, venting their ſad and diſcontented thoughts, in thoſe ſorrowfull notes you are pleaſed to ſet downe. *That trading is dead: There money goes: Never ſo many payments.* I cannot blame them, I confeſſe, to think they pay ſomething too deare for their ruine: but what's the ſalve you give them for their ſore? why, ſurely they are like to find but little comfort from you. Firſt, you tell ſuch a man, that he

is not worth the answering. And I tell you, that he that gives such an answer, is scarce worthy to receive a replie unto it. And therefore let that goe. But yet upon second thoughts you are a little more pitifull. And in some doubt of his capacitie you send him to learne of Job, *That we must receive good at the hand of God, as well as evill.* True, there is very good reason for it, that they should be patient in misery, and thankfull in prosperity, unto God. But yet under favour, this doth not infer that men are bound to contribute to their owne miseries, or be any way accessary to draw them upon themselves, no nor yet to returne any thankes unto those that are the instruments of their calamity: we must submit to Gods justice even in the oppression of men, and yet that doth no way justifie their oppression, nor hinder us from the use of any lawfull meanes to deliver our selves from them and those pressures they would lay upon us: it no way ties us to give our selves up into their hands, or to consent to our owne ruine.

Thirdly, you tell them, that the Gospell hath beene a beaceable plentifull Gospell, and then they loved it, ran after it. But now it is otherwise they are otherwise affected, and you commend unto them that of our Saviour, *Joh. 6. 26.* you follow me for the loaves.

And hath the Gospell beene so peaceable and plentifull a Gospell, when was that, I beseech you? under what Kings raign? or, how comes it to passe that it is not so still? Surely, if that Gospell could have contented you and others, that have beene so amourous of changes: that which was amongst us in the time of Queene *Elizabeth*, King *James*, or in any part of the raigne of our Gracious King, I am well assured you might have had it, in as peaceable and plentifull a condition as ever, if men had not beene weary of Gods blessings. His Majestie hath made you very faire offers, if they might have been embraced; but it seems you are growne weary of that Manna, and your wanton palates are fallen a lusting after some new diet. And because other men will not be perswaded to part with all they have to serve your humours: you seeme to challenge them of temporizing, and that they measure out their zeale by their worldly advantage.

tage. This is indeed a hainous crime I confeſſe, like the rich man in the Goſpell, to goe away ſorrowfull from Chriſt, becauſe he requires him to part with his eſtate, or with the Gadarens to drive him out of their coaſts, upon the apprehenſion of the loſſe of a few ſwine. They that will part with our Saviour or his Goſpell upon ſuch termes as theſe, are very worthie of their owne choice even to looſe that Jewell that they hold at ſo low a rate. But that this is the caſe of every one that refuſeth to undoe his wife and children, to ſupply you with his eſtate, to buie fuell for that fire which is now raging in the bowels of the Church and Common-wealth: or, that it is to be diſaffected to the Goſpell of Chriſt, not to promote a warre againſt the ſubſtitute of Chriſt, is a paradoxe that I can never admit into my beliefe, nor doe I thinke the ſpeech of our Saviour in the 6. of *John* 26. is any thing at all to your purpoſe. And therefore you are no good Quackſalver for melancholy. The people may even die of their purſe-dumps, for any remedie you here afford them.

But it may be you are better at the cure of their follie. That's the ſixth and laſt conſideration, which you ſay *is a meere fooliſh one, if it may be ſo termed: or rather* (*for fooles alſo will be talking*) *a meere prating, a meere nothing*, and *non-ſenſicall thoughts about the preſent things in the Kingdom. within the verge of this you ſhall include* (you ſay) *the indiſcreet running before authority, in things where the command and countermand are not alike, and this* (you ſay) *you ſhall deſire to be propoſed in theſe two Propoſitions.*

Firſt, manners to ſtay the States leaſure: but,

Secondly, Is it any offence to doe their worke for them? And you conclude with much gravitie thus; *Good meaning may be grounded on errours: But the bad muſt be ſhadowed with colours:* and ſo you commend unto your Countreymen, *whoſe ſalvation you ſay, if you know your owne heart you earneſtly deſire*, your notes and your ſelfe with an apologie; firſt, for your ſelfe, that *you have ſpoken unto Chriſtians like a Chriſtian.* Secondly, for your notes, whereof you ſay, that *none can be ſo ignorant, as they are plaine to a mind deſirous to learne*, and for the percaſe you

ſay it is *ſuch as you can ſpeake, and you deſire to be thankfull it is no worſe*, conſidering *your deſerts*. And laſtly you ſay, *there is not all that might be ſaid, but what you could ſay, which if it may ſerve the Church, the publike, the Lord Jeſus, and your Reader, you ſay you have your end, deſiring his prayers for your ſelfe, under the ſtile of the pooreſt of All the ſervants of Jeſus Chriſt, W. Bridges.*

Give me leave to run over this you have here ſaid. And firſt, for that which concernes your Anſwer to the peoples miſtakes in this laſt which you call a *meere fooliſh conſideration, a meere prating, a meere nothing and nonſenſicall thought*, about *the preſent things of the Kingdome*: What this fooliſh prating nonſenſe of things is, I can ſcarce diſcover, that you are ſo angrie at, and therefore I could wiſh you had bin more cleer and leſſe paſſionate in your accuſation: only ſomething you tell us firſt, of an indiſcreet running before authoritie in things wherein the command and countermand are not alike. Truly I can ſcarce tell how to make ſenſe of what you ſay, for what things are thoſe wherein the command and countermand can be alike? or what doe you intend by this deſignation? but yet I can find out ſomething here to thanke you for, that you would not have the people indiſcreetly to run before authority; if they had taken this counſell, or had it given them in convenient time, I conceive things had never beene ſo bad as they are, for what were thoſe Tumults that have had ſo great a ſhare in the bringing of things to this ſad condition they are now in, but an indiſcreet running before authority? and therefore thus farre we joyne, and I wiſh your counſell may be well imbraced. For farther explication you offer your mind in theſe two propoſitions.

Firſt, *Manners to ſtay the States leiſure*, This is ſome thing ſhort of a propoſition; but if I miſtake not, your meaning is, *that you would have the people have ſo much manners to ſtay the leiſure of the State, and not to take upon them to doe things of themſelves to the diſturbance of the worke.* I heartily conſent unto you, in this likewiſe. Onely I deſire that His Majeſty may be underſtood as a man of authority, and a principall part of the State, and than take heed you condemne not your ſelfe, and

caſt

caſt a blemiſh upon the whole carriage of your deſigne.

Your ſecond propoſition as you call it, ſeemes to be a reply to an expoſtulation of the people, whom you ſeeme to bring in juſtifying their raſhneſſe, with this queſtion, *whether it be any offence for them to doe the worke of the State for them?* (this if I underſtand you is your meaning.) And to this you returne your anſwer thus, *you tell them that good meaning may be grounded on errours, but the bad muſt be ſhadowed with colours.* And truly I ſee nothing much amiſſe in this, but your miſ-application; for herein methinks you ſet before us the very complexion of that unhappy buſineſſe you would ſeeme to plead for, at the beſt you can make of it; if there be any thing good in it, it hath onely this, not for the juſtification of the buſineſſe, but it may be for the excuſe or extenuation of the fault of ſome that have beene ſeduced and engaged therein; that it is a matter of errour in them, not of any evill or malicious intention; but this excuſe I doubt me will not ſerve you all: there are ſome amongſt you too knowing to plead ſuch ignorance. And where errour is wanting, they have nothing to hide their bad meaning withall, but the ſhaddow of ſome ſpecious colours, which are at once both a cloud to hide them, and to blind others withall. If wee could but prevaile ſo farre as to ſeparate errours from the good meaning of ſome, or remove the falſe colours from the bad meaning of others, things would than appeare againe in their owne ſhapes, and diſobedience and bloud-ſhed would be no longer purſued with rejection of obedience and peace; and ſo there would enſue a perfect accommodation. For that which followes, I have but little to ſay, onely *I commend unto my Countrey-men too theſe Notes of mine to be conſidered with yours*, and *I am ſure I earneſtly deſire their ſalvation*, I will *not yeild* to you a little in that; and being glad that you acknowledge us *Chriſtians* yet, and that indeed was ſpoken like a Chriſtian, if all the reſt of your Preface had ſavoured as much of a Chriſtian as this, I ſhould never have ſpent time upon this worke; for the Apologie you make for your notes, how plaine they are, or what the phraſe of them is, I leave them to judge that ſhall read them. I am ſure for the ſubſtance of them

it

it is so bad as you apply it, that it doth bespeak you of none of the best deserts; and whether this be all you could, or that others might have said to your purpose, I list not much to examine, I know it is much more than you should, or than any other ought to have spoken. And you have much fayled of your end, if you thought by this to serve either the Church, the Publike, the Lord *Jesus*, or your Reader, and therefore you have my prayers, that the Lord would give either more knowledge or more sincerity; if this latter be your want, let me give you my advise in the words of your quotation in the margin out of Saint *Augustine*, (a little altered) *Qui non valuit non ponitenda dixisse, pœniteat quæ cognovit non dicenda fecisse.* And so I have done with your Preface. I see no great matter in your Sermon, that doth deserve an Answer, and I have other businesse to doe.

FINIS.

Library of the
UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
New York